



**Evaluation and Development
Information Methods IQC**

**THE UNITED STATES
AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT,
AMERICAN LABOR, AND
DEMOCRACY ABROAD**

May 1991

for
United States Agency for International Development

Prepared by:

Christine M. Sadowski

A contract between the U.S. Agency for International Development and the
Academy for Educational Development, Contract No. PDC-0085-I-00-9061-00.

AED

**THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
AMERICAN LABOR, AND DEMOCRACY ABROAD**

**Christine M. Sadowski
May 1991**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

1.	Introduction: Democracy, Labor and the U.S. Government.....	1
	a. Free Labor Unions Promote Democracy.....	
	b. The U.S. Government, American Labor, and Foreign Policy.....	
	c. American Taxpayers, Labor and Foreign Policy....	
2.	The Regional Labor Union Institutes of the AFL-CIO.....	7
	a. Introduction to the Regional Labor Union Institutes.....	
	b. Why does the AFL-CIO Engage in Economic Development Programs Abroad?.....	
	c. An Overview of the Types of Activities Undertaken by the Regional Labor Union Institutes to Promote Democracy.....	
	(1) pluralism.....	
	(2) civil society.....	
	(3) advocacy.....	
	(4) free elections.....	
	(5) democratic values and behaviors.....	
	(6) human and civil rights.....	
	(7) access to information.....	
	d. Union-to-Union Programs.....	
3.	Case Studies of Country Programs.....	31
	a. Poland.....	
	b. Botswana.....	
	c. Thailand.....	
	d. Venezuela.....	
4.	Other Labor Programs.....	59
	a. Inter-American Foundation: Trade Union Education Institutes.....	
	b. Department of Labor: International Labor Visitors Program.....	
5.	Democracy and the Foreign Policy of the AFL-CIO.....	65
	a. Unique Aspects of American Labor in the International Arena.....	
	b. An Overview of the Foreign Policy Concerns of American Labor.....	
	c. Ideological Splits within the American Labor Movement over Issues of Foreign Policy.....	
	d. Recent Changes in the Strategy of the AFL-CIO Foreign Policy	

6.	Issues: US/AID, the AFL-CIO and Democracy.....	79
	a. Making Choices and Promoting Democracy.....	
	b. On Language, Sound, and Political War.....	
	c. Economic Development versus the Promotion of Democracy.....	
	d. Political Conditionality.....	
	e. US/AID, the AFL-CIO and the Arena for International Democratic Development.....	
7.	Methods of Evaluation.....	92
	a. The Lack of Adequate Documentation.....	
	b. The Relationship Between US/AID and the Regional Labor Union Institutes.....	
	c. Working with the Existing Evaluations and Reports.....	
	d. Attributing Credit for Program Success.....	
	e. The Time, the Place, and the Point of View.....	
	f. Ideologies, Programs and Evaluations.....	
8.	Visions for the Future.....	106
9.	Recommendations.....	109
10.	Appendices.....	113
	a. List of Projects by Region.....	
	b. List of People Interviewed.....	
	c. Sample Training Courses Offered at the George Meany Center for Labor Studies.....	
	d. Sample Syllabus for International Visitors Seminars offered by the Department of Labor.....	
11.	Footnotes.....	129

PREFACE

Statement of Purpose

The motivation behind this report can ultimately be found in the changing socio-political landscape, most graphically evident in Latin American and Central and Eastern Europe in the last few years, where the battle cry for "democracy" as an ideal has been heard everywhere from demonstrators in city squares to voting booths at freely held elections.

The question being posed by the ^{h. j.} United States Agency for International Development was ~~whether or not~~ the Agency should incorporate political development, in the form of the promotion of democratization, into its programs of economic assistance. The first step in making such a decision was to compile an inventory of the types of projects AID had funded in the past that contributed to the promotion or enhancement of democratic societies. The questions being asked were: what programs have already been undertaken to advance the cause of democracy abroad; have these programs been effective; what types of problems have these programs encountered; how realistic or advisable is it for AID to incorporate democratic development into its institutional programming; and, what types of programmatic or administrative adjustments would have to be made?

This particular report on labor unions and democracy is but one part of a larger study that includes topics such as U.S. government policy issues, various understandings of the term "democracy", as well as topical issues such as human rights, the administration of justice, campaigns and elections, political parties, and decentralization. It is not meant to be the type of evaluation that determines specifically whether or not money is being well-spent, or even to measure, with any precision, the impact these projects have had on the host society. That type of an

evaluation would require site-visits which, for now, were beyond the scope of this "inventory-issues" orientated analysis.

The object of this report is to (a) document the types of activities undertaken to link labor and democracy abroad; (b) introduce the institutional actors involved in sponsoring, designing and coordinating these programs; (c) raise specific issues of current concern to labor unions in their promotion of democracy, i.e., issues that present them with challenges in executing their programs; (d) raise issues of concern by other groups and organizations regarding the manner in which American trade unions promote democracy abroad; and finally, (e) define some of the "democracy-directed" issues labor unions may have to face in the future.

Methods of data collection

The information included in this report was gathered through a number of personal interviews conducted with administrators and staff members of the AFL-CIO's Regional Labor Union Institutes, representatives from individual AFL-CIO affiliates involved in international programming, relevant AID personnel, Department of Labor personnel, staff members of NGOs engaged in international programs involving workers and labor, and finally, private consulting agencies (the names and affiliations of the people interviewed are listed in Appendix B). In addition, earlier evaluations of AID-funded labor union programs were reviewed, beginning with the initial work of the American Institute for Free Labor Development in the 1960s, through the more recent programs of the African American Labor Center and the Asian American Free Labor Institute. No evaluation of recent AID-funded programs by the Free Labor Institute has been undertaken to date. Finally, secondary source materials were used in the form of scholarly analyses of the link between labor and democracy abroad; promotional material and

information handbooks published by the AFL-CIO; as well as promotional materials published by the critics of the AFL-CIO.

Acknowledgements

I feel indebted to each of the individuals who devoted so much time to explaining the details of various programs, policies, successes, challenges and concerns regarding labor and democracy. But I am especially grateful to the federation and union administrators themselves, most of whom spent hours with me outlining, defining, clarifying and defending their programs and policies -- I include here both the promoters of the AFL-CIO's foreign policy and their critics. Collecting the information included in this report was as interesting as it was frustrating, in that the foreign policy of the Federation is extremely complex in its history and subtle in its political twists. Moreover, AID had never before done an inventory of the political aspects of projects undertaken by the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO. This meant that, in many cases, those unionists interviewed had to tell the story "from the very beginning". I hope this document will serve as a source of information to those within the Agency for International Development who are interested in the political aspects of labor union activity abroad.

The Organization of this Report

Section 1 begins with an introductory statement on the relationship between the U.S. government, American labor, and the promotion of democracy abroad; Section 2 details those aspects of the AFL-CIO's international programs that contribute to the advancement of democracy abroad; Section 3 describes labor programs of the AFL-CIO in specific countries, representing each of the regions in which they operate; Section 4 provides information on labor programs sponsored by agencies and organizations other than the

-C

AFL-CIO; Section 5 focuses on the foreign policy of the AFL-CIO and the critics of that policy; Section 6 introduces problematic issues regarding the relationship between US/AID, the AFL-CIO, and democracy, including questions of definitions of democracy and the tension between economic and political priorities; Section 7 turns to the issue of evaluations, why they are problematic (even necessarily so) and how they must change to incorporate democratization as a goal; Section 8 turns to the future of democracy abroad, through the eyes of labor leaders; and, Section 9 provides several recommendations on how to better link AID to democratic programs through the American labor movement, and on the types of structural and administrative adjustments that would need to be made. Appendices are attached, as Section 10, that (a) list the projects undertaken by the American labor movement and funded by AID; (b) list the people interviewed for this report; (c) list examples of courses on democracy, provided for foreign trade unionists, by the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO; and (d) provide a sample syllabus of the labor courses sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor. Footnotes for the entire report are attached, as Section 11, at the end of this manuscript.

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION: DEMOCRACY, LABOR AND THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

Free Labor Unions Promote Democracy

Free and independent labor unions, by their very definition, are organizations that promote democracy. While their principal function is to promote the economic well-being of their memberships, free labor unions engage in the democratic process in order to achieve their goals.

It would be difficult to imagine a democratic society without labor unions. These are the organizations, after all, that give a political voice to workers and wage earners whose individual (i.e., unorganized) needs would otherwise go unrecognized by those who hold power in traditional societies. This function of trade unions is aptly described in the following statement:

*"It is particularly in the early stages of economic development, when the resistance of a traditional society has to be overcome, when the necessary institutional changes -- for instance, doing away with an archaic land tenure system or an inequitable tax system or reforming the educational system -- spell success or failure of all economic measures, that a union's support of the reform forces appears indispensable. Where the body politic is in the hands of the vested interests of a minority, the mass ... demonstration and extralegal pressure on society becomes one of the most powerful means of bringing about peaceful change. For this role, the union is eminently equipped."*⁰¹

At more advanced stages of democratization, institutionalized mechanisms exist for labor to exert political influence on governments, without resorting to mass demonstrations. Simply put, free trade unions become the avenues through which workers' needs can be articulated. Moreover, it was determined by the American labor movement, that it was not enough for workers to gain political power simply vis-a-vis their employers. Workers, in order to gain

a measure of control over the conditions of their work, would also have to gain power in the context of national politics, "for what is won in bargaining can be taken away by the state."⁰²

Lane Kirkland, however, points to yet another dimension -- namely, the social structure of a developing society -- to further underline the importance of unionization.

*"In the developing world, free unions provide the underpinning for economic growth and democracy by contributing to the emergence of a stable, fairly paid, working middle-class. Without free unions, developing countries enrich only narrowly based economic and political elites, while the vast majority of their increasingly alienated citizens suffer from poverty."*⁰³

The U.S. Government, American Labor, and Foreign Policy

The United States government acknowledged the importance of labor in the formulation of its foreign policy, following the Second World War, when it established the practice of assigning labor attaches to embassy posts (primarily, at first, in Latin America) and setting up international labor policy offices at the Departments of State and of Labor. Thirty years ago, the United States government officially recognized the importance of free trade unions abroad in promoting democratic ideals and in furthering the nation's foreign policy. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as amended 22 U.S.C. §2151 et. seq.) referred twice to the promotion of free labor unions as a component of American foreign policy. Section 207(e), 22 U.S.C. §2167 states that in

"...furnishing development assistance...the President shall place appropriate emphasis on...the growth of free labor unions, cooperatives, and voluntary agencies...."

Section 601(a), 22 U.S.C. §2351(a), indicates that

"...it is declared to be the policy of the United States...to encourage the development and use of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan institutions...and to strengthen free labor unions...."

More specifically, the international activities of the AFL-CIO reflect a mandate for A.I.D., within the Foreign Assistance Act, to implement a labor policy

"to strengthen free, effective, and well-organized trade unions representing both urban and rural workers for the purpose of protecting their legitimate rights, ... to improve the well-being of the workers, help to assure the equitable distribution of income, and act as a force for change on issues related to working conditions, human rights, and family...."

The U.S. Congress has recognized the interdependence between economic development and worker rights and has stipulated that economic aid, through the exercise of political conditionality, should be linked with the "right of fair return on labor" and on adherence to international agreements relating to "free and fair trade practices and to respect for worker rights."⁴

American Taxpayers, Labor, and Foreign Policy

U.S. economic assistance, for the promotion of free labor unions in developing countries, is appropriated to the American Federation of Labor and Congress of International Organizations (AFL-CIO). The foreign policy arm of the AFL-CIO is its Department of International Affairs, which in turn, operationalizes and implements its policies through four regional institutes (technically, non-profit corporations): the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), that operates in Latin America and the

Caribbean; the African American Labor Center (AALC); the Asian American Free Labor Institute (AAFLI); and the Free Trade Union Institute (FTUI), that worked originally in Spain and Portugal, but focuses its attention now on Central and Eastern Europe and, increasingly, on the Soviet Union. The Free Trade Union Institute has the additional function of distributing Congressional funds to the other three regional labor union institutes. While there are other government agencies and private voluntary organizations that sponsor labor programs aimed at furthering the cause of democracy, the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO are the major players in this regard and will remain the primary, though not exclusive, focus of this report.

By far, most of the money used by the regional labor union institutes for their activities abroad is appropriated by Congress and, of that money, the largest percentage by far, comes through US/AID, with smaller amounts being granted through the United States Information Agency via the National Endowment for Democracy. Only a very small percentage of the funding for its international activities comes directly from the AFL-CIO. Federation president, Lane Kirkland, justifies these large annual Congressional appropriations to the AFL-CIO (which is, after all, a non-government organization) by arguing that the funds are in fact U.S. tax dollars, paid to the federal government in large part by his constituency. Kirkland goes on to say that American workers have a vested interest in promoting the rights of workers in developing countries, in that:

(a) American workers cannot compete with workers in developing countries who earn 50¢ to 75¢ an hour;

(b) if the wages of workers in developing countries remain so low, those countries will not constitute a market for American goods;

(c) the proliferation of multinational corporations has resulted in the need for a common strategy among workers throughout the world in their pursuit of better working

conditions, higher wages, and an improvement in their quality of life.⁰⁵

At first glance, it seems curious, indeed, that American tax dollars should be going to an American private voluntary organization for the promotion of its own foreign policy -- a policy that does not always coincide with that of the U.S. Department of State. But the utilization of a domestic labor movements for the enhancement of national foreign policy objectives is certainly not unique to the United States. West European political parties have coinciding labor union offices that promote their political agendas abroad. It is, in fact, the rather "exceptional" nature of the American political system that has resulted in the fact that the Democratic and Republican Parties do not have their own, separate, union movements through which to promote separate and competing labor programs, both domestically and in the international arena. A discussion of the foreign policy of the AFL-CIO, and the ways in which it coincides and conflicts with policies of the U.S. Department of State is provided later in this report.

why? I
the new
for PVO

SECTION 2

THE REGIONAL LABOR UNION INSTITUTES OF THE AFL-CIO

Introduction to the Regional Labor Union Institutes

Each of the regional labor union institutes has its own individual history and its own unique set of problems and issues that needs to be addressed in different areas of the world. Obviously, labor union concerns in a nation like South Africa are vastly different from those in Hungary, just as union matters in El Salvador differ from those in the Solomon Islands.

The oldest of the institutes is the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), founded in 1961, and funded the following year as part of the Kennedy Administration's Alliance for Progress. AIFLD was created at the time that Castro's Cuba was viewed at the first step in the possible spread of communism throughout Central and South America. Its purpose was to supplement U.S. programs of economic aid with the formation of viable democratic institutions that would organize and defend the rights of otherwise powerless workers, as well as to establish a labor movement presence that would combat dictatorships of the extreme right and left.

In 1964, the African-American Labor Center (AALC) was founded in response to African struggles for independence. An opportunity had presented itself to provide African laborers with democratic trade union options. This was followed by the creation of the Asian American Free Labor Institute (AAFLI) in 1968, to address the needs of democratic unions in Asia and the Pacific. Finally, the Free Trade Union Institute (FTUI) was founded in 1977 to work with European unions, particularly those in Spain and Portugal that were newly freed from government control.⁰⁶ Since that time, FTUI has conducted most of its activities in the newly emergent democracies of Central and Eastern Europe. For administrative reasons, FTUI, since 1983, has been the regional office through which money from the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) has been distributed to AIFLD, AALC and AAFLI. The regional labor union

institutes maintain field offices throughout the world and conduct additional programs from ^{these} Washington headquarters in countries where field offices do not exist. ✓

Why does the AFL-CIO, through its regional labor union institute's, engage in economic development programs abroad?

The marriage between US/AID and the AFL-CIO is a curious one, and the extent to which their goals are in conflict with each other will be discussed in Section 6. For now, suffice it to say that the differences between the two institutions are not irreconcilable.

US/AID and the AFL-CIO have found a common ground in engaging in economic development programs abroad. However, while US/AID measures its success in terms of improvements in the local or national economy of a country, the AFL-CIO and its regional labor union institutes measure their success in terms of increased union membership. Thus, ~~while pursuing its own goals, the programs of the AFL-CIO complement those of US/AID.~~

The economic development projects in which the regional institutes participate might include the establishment of cooperatives, credit unions, extension of welfare services to union members, health care, nutrition, housing projects, agricultural development, etc. They engage in such projects, in part, to increase the standard of living and quality of life of workers. But, as mentioned earlier, their primary purpose is to increase membership, increase the commitment of members to the union, and ultimately form a power base within the union structure that can have an impact on the government and on the society at large. The idea is that by forming a powerful union, workers will be better able to defend their rights and interests on an ongoing basis. In the meantime, the economic development projects serve to enhance the credibility of the union. The savings cooperative that the AALC helped establish for railway workers in Botswana, for example, was so successful

that it nearly doubled union membership.⁰⁷ Likewise, an AALC-assisted workers' service organization in Botswana is expected to improve the stature of a labor movement that is otherwise handicapped by government restrictions.⁰⁸

Service activities in Mauritius increased membership in the Mauritius Labor Congress.⁰⁹ Such membership services also provide work for the unemployed or generate the money needed to provide trainers and training courses. Thus, they contribute to the future self-sufficiency of the unions themselves. In Korea, the main Federation of Korean Trade Unions (FKTU) was able to survive various periods of government repression during which time union leaders were removed from their positions of power. Those union leaders retained a power base by moving into the cooperatives they themselves had sponsored with the assistance of AAFLI, but which were mistakenly viewed by the government as purely economic, and therefore apolitical, organizations. When the political climate changed, union leaders resumed their union positions.

It is also true that in many LDCs, workers are unable to negotiate wage increases because employers and governments are simply too poor. In other cases, government restrictions on collective bargaining and strikes prevent unions from becoming political actors. Thus, the regional labor union institutes focus on development programs that will increase the standard of living for unionists and, in doing so, potentially increase union membership while promoting AID goals of economic development.

An overview of the types of activities undertaken by the regional labor union institutes to promote democracy

The regional trade union institutes describe their major project areas as including: (a) worker education (fundamental training in trade union basics, administration, labor law, industrial relations and communication skills, as well as more advanced training in labor economics, and

research and documentation methods); (b) union organizational support (providing equipment and technical assistance); (c) union service project development (union-sponsored cooperatives, credit unions, employment and income generation schemes, union medical and social welfare programs, and literacy programs); (d) union information and research (teaching research and data collection skills, as well as journalism, and providing necessary equipment for union publications); and (e) study tours/visitor programs/union-to-union programs (involving exchanges between unionists in the U.S. and their counterparts abroad -- coordinated through the International Trade Secretariats).¹⁰

Below is a list of the many direct and indirect ways in which democracy is promoted in developing countries through union activities whose primary goal is to expand union membership and improve the economic well-being of members. The list was developed by the author, not by the regional labor union institutes, for the purpose of better organizing the information presented in this report. Such a list, reflecting various aspects of democracy, was necessary because, until now, AID has focused exclusively, in its grant proposals and evaluations, on those aspects of free trade unionism that promote economic development. Therefore, in order to examine political development, a new rubric had to be devised. The activities of the regional labor institutes have not changed, but here they are being examined in a new light.

Most of the activities and programs described in this section on unions and democracy were funded by AID. A few programs whose goals fall outside the specific mandates of AID, were funded by the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), with money provided by the United States Information Agency (USIA). Finally, for activities such as the mobilization of workers' strikes, money is provided directly by the AFL-CIO.

The list that follows begins with the most fundamental aspects of democracy, including (1) pluralism and (2) the development of a civil society (both of which create the basic infrastructure for a democratic order); proceeds to those characteristics that define the democratic process, such as (3) advocacy and (4) free elections; and turns finally to some more specific components of democracy such as (5) the adoption of democratic values and behaviors (6) the promotion of human and civil rights, and (7) access to alternative sources of information. Unless otherwise noted, the information gathered for this section of the report was taken directly from interviews with representatives of the regional labor union institutes.

CAN

(1) Free labor unions contribute to pluralism in a society by providing an organizational structure, based on mutually shared interests of members, that joins people together for the purpose of promoting or resisting change.

At the grassroots level of society, democracy is built on an infrastructure composed of a variety of interdependent, overlapping, or, indeed, competing private voluntary associations, each of which reflects the specific interests of its membership. Where such groups or memberships are interdependent or overlapping, they contribute to cooperation and stability in a democratic system, as commitment to certain goals extend across group boundaries; where they are competing, they contribute to that aspect of democracy that calls for a plurality of opinions, positions, and strategies.

At the most basic level, the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO build organizations. They attempt to create a civil society in developing countries that would engage a broad range of private individuals in determining the direction of national political, social and economic

development. Oftentimes, free and democratic trade unions are the only alternative source of allegiance for workers in single-party states. For example, the private consulting firm, Development Associates, made the following statement in a 1989 evaluation of the AALC:

*"In the African context, the trade union movements are primary examples of democratic pluralism. In many countries they stand above tribalism, offer practice in democratic techniques through election of union officials, resist government repression, and offer an independent source of allegiance for hundreds of thousands. With more widespread appreciation of the links between democratic pluralism and economic development, African labor organizations should attain increased importance in the thinking and planning of those involved with the process of nation-building."*¹¹

Thus, trade unions are capable of placing commonly shared worker interests above the historical, traditional and well-entrenched divisions in developing societies that are based solely on tribal membership, ethnic groups, religious affiliation, or gender. In many developing societies, labor unions are the first arena in which members of different societal groups can come together for a common purpose. The AALC-sponsored trade unions in Sudan have been described in the past as "the only place that northerners and southerners can meet on an equal basis."¹² One could certainly argue in such a case, that the trade unions themselves had a "democratizing" effect on their members, casting aside status that had been ascribed by virtue of birth.

In addition to building and strengthening free and independent democratic unions, the regional labor union institutes work with individual trade unions to form more powerful federations or to form coalitions with other types of organizations. An example of the latter would be AAFLI's assistance to the TUCP (Trade Union Congress of the Philippines) to form coalitions with Filipino peace groups.

(2) The regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO contribute to the development of civil societies by engaging unionists in organizational activities that seek to promote change, thereby empowering citizens who may otherwise feel they can have little impact over their own lives.

Civil society refers to a culture of socio-political participation that engages citizens in activities requiring self-initiative -- in areas such as setting priorities, cooperating, overcoming obstacles, motivating other group members, developing strategy, etc. -- for the purpose of achieving a mutually held goal. Such activity is empowering to private citizens, first, because it gives them a sense of being able to bring about change in their own lives and, second, because it ultimately provides them with the skills necessary to assume independent political positions.

Through their training programs, the regional labor union institutes provide unionists internationally with the skills needed for them to act in their own behalf. In doing so, the institutes contribute to the creation of a civic culture in developing societies.

A civil society need not be created around strictly political issues. It can, for example, revolve around issues of economic development, health and nutrition, literacy campaigns, sanitation, or any of a number of areas in which citizens seek to achieve a mutually held goal. For example, the Ceylon Workers Congress (CWC), together with the Asian-American Free Labor Institute, embarked on a project ultimately aimed at increasing the membership and enhancing the reputation of the CWC in Sri Lanka. The challenge was to integrate the Indian Tamils, working on tea estates, into the mainstream of Sri Lankan life. In order to do so, "the union leadership began to consider long-term plans to undo centuries-old habits of servility and dependence among the workers..." The watchwords for the project became initiative, resourcefulness, self-reliance,

and self-confidence. While this story is told in an AAFLI promotional pamphlet,¹³ behind this "gung-ho" spirit is the basis for the construction of a civil society where none had previously existed. Through this program, the CWC and AAFLI determined the needs of the community and then organized the tea workers into health committees (made up of local graduates of a union-provided medical training program in preventative medicine, first-aid and personal hygiene) to combat disease. In addition to achieving the immediate goal of tending to the health-care needs of the community, "the workers began to see that they were capable of organizing and being organized -- of administering their own affairs." Ultimately, this enhanced the reputation of the CWC. There are hundreds of such examples of projects sponsored by the regional labor union institutes, and funded by AID.

CAN

(3) As independent organizations within a given society, free labor unions form "intermediary groups" through which the interests of memberships can be represented to the government. This constitutes their advocacy role.

The main reason behind mobilizing workers into action through free and democratic labor unions is to empower individual citizens over their own lives and to help them, acting in unison as a mass organization, to resist unfair practices or repression by employers or government. The regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO assist unions in gaining access to power by teaching them how to act as lobbying organizations or as advocacy groups, pressuring governments to recognize their rights and to enact legislation to protect those rights. Worker rights encompass a very broad range of issues including, for example, health care, women's rights, property rights, copyright law, worker safety, voter rights, and education.

In order to gain or protect such rights, the regional institutes of the AFL-CIO help local unions either identify or create channels through which their interests can be articulated. Finally, unionists are taught to formulate sophisticated positions on national issues by learning how to gather information, develop strategy, and argue a position at the national level.

There are many cases in which the regional institutes have been successful in engaging local unions or federations in policy-making, whether through influence, popular pressure or direct involvement. The Latin American examples that follow are taken from Project Appraisal Reports and Project Evaluation Summaries, written by labor attaches and AID mission directors. For instance, a 1970 report on Uruguay stated that:

*"CUT [Confederation of Uruguayan Workers] representatives have been named to several national and international commissions by the GOU [Government of Uruguay] during 1970, the first time non-communist labor has achieved such recognition in many years."*¹⁴

A 1973 report on Colombia made the following observation:

*"Through maintaining its independence and neutrality of political party affiliation, the Colombian labor movement has become a key pressure group in behalf of workers; ... Many union leaders are active participants on the governing boards of key governmental economic and social institutions at the national regional and local level. These include the Bank of the Republic, the Banco Popular, and the National Apprenticeship Training Service (SENA)."*¹⁵

For Guatemala, a 1973-74 report indicated that:

"Over the past two years, the labor movement drafted and proposed to the GOG [Government of Guatemala] an entirely new Labor Code. Drafted by an AIFLD graduate [of the training programs], the new Code was under serious consideration by Congress. All sectors of the labor movement hailed the effort as beneficial."¹⁶

Regarding Paraguay in 1974, reports described that:

There have been some positive signs of progress, such as the successful lobbying efforts of the CPT [Confederation with which union federations in Paraguay are affiliated] in favor of amplification of social security benefits and improved wages and working conditions in the rural areas which resulted in the passage of favorable legislation. Also, the CPT has representatives on numerous government agencies...¹⁷

In Honduras (1976-77):

"Workers, through their democratic labor organizations are participating in many aspects of ... political and socio-economic development of Honduras. Labor and campesino groups are present in the Advisory Council to the Chief of State, the National Development Bank, and other governmental and financial institutions."¹⁸

A summary report on Chile, 1978-79, stated that:

"While more and more union leaders have become sharply critical of the [Government of Chile's] labor policy, the AIFLD representative reports that authorities have become more open and at times receptive to this criticism. The Labor Minister has met frequently with a much wider spectrum of leaders. The "Group of Ten",¹⁹ a group of Christian Democrat labor leaders, which now numbers "25", has

demonstrated increased capacity to channel general discontent into pragmatic union action. The result has been doubling of its membership and a growing influence in many rank and file organizations of other labor centers."²⁰

In 1989, the Federation of Korean Trade Unions, with the assistance of AAFLI, set out to mobilize support for the federation's legislative agenda:

"Solidarity seminars were held for trade union leaders that aimed at strengthening inter-organizational support for its legislative proposals. The federation also included a special lecture in the curriculum of its rank-and-file labor education seminars on the FKTU's legislative activities and proposals to revise the labor law. Such activities were completely unprecedented in a society where common people have traditionally not been allowed to influence political debate. In addition, the FKTU maintained regular contact with senior officials of all the political parties and with senior government officials to encourage them to support the FKTU's legislative agenda."²¹

In the Philippines, the TUCP (the main federation of free labor unions), with the technical assistance of AAFLI, developed an independent position, not necessarily supportive of U.S. interests, on the presence of American military bases. The TUCP, with the technical assistance of the AAFLI, now lobbies Congress in the Philippines. This labor federation became a rallying point for the opposition during the final period of the Marcos regime, and took part in writing the new Constitution of the Philippines.

In Thailand, pressure from labor unions resulted in the creation of a labor court to help with difficult arbitration cases. Thai workers also submitted a proposal for a system of social security and influenced legislation on this matter.

In Botswana, the government initiated a new wage income policy and the AALC sent representatives over to assist unions in developing a response. But not all instances of attempts by unions to assume advocacy roles in their societies have been stellar successes. In Mauritius, for example, the Mauritius Labour Congress met with only limited success in its attempt in the late 1980s to organize workers in export processing zones of the sugar industry. Likewise, the results of the MLC's efforts to change existing labor legislation, so as to enhance the role of collective bargaining in labor disputes, were similarly disappointing.²²

Finally, it must be said that the advocacy role of labor unions is important not only vis-a-vis governments, but also, and perhaps more commonly, vis-a-vis employers. Among countless examples of the work of the regional labor union institutes in this particular area, the following one is offered:

"In 1986 the MTUC [Malaysian Trades Union Congress], with assistance from AAFLI, opened the doors of a "service center" in the Bayan Lepas Free Trade Zone on Penang. The Service Center is an instrument of labor solidarity that reaches out to workers and provides them a variety of programs and services that help strengthen their hand in dealing with their employers. Over the years, the Center has conducted organizing campaigns for which they work -- wages, severance pay, illegal and unjustified terminations, and the desire by workers for form unions."²³

CAN

(4) Free labor unions promote free union elections and assist in the execution of free national elections.

The training offered by the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO includes issues such as how to

select and elect a leader and what qualities to look for in an effective union president. In some countries in Africa, the free elections that take place at the union level are the only elections in which citizens have a free vote by secret ballot.²⁴

In accordance with the principles of non-partisanship embodied in the by-laws of the AFL-CIO (a characteristic that is rather unique among unions in democratic societies), regional labor union institutes do not assume a partisan stance in elections at the national or local level. Instead, they teach union members about the role of trade unions in the election process; how to determine which candidates best reflect union interests; how to interview candidates for union endorsement; and how to hold endorsed candidates accountable for their actions and inactions.

The regional labor union institutes have helped in organizing national free elections by assisting in the registration of voters (e.g., in Thailand, Bangladesh, Philippines, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Haiti) and by getting members out to exercise their right to vote. In some places, they have provided transportation to voting centers on election day. In Hungary, FTUI paid for ads that encouraged voters to exercise their newly won right to a free vote by secret ballot, and taught unionists how best to present their issues in the mass media. In Bulgaria, FTUI sponsored a course on how to get people out to vote and on how, once elected, a person goes about getting a program passed. All regional institutes have also provided international election observers to ensure elections are free and fair. A final example is one in which the AALC sponsored a project (with funding from NED) in which eight Nigerian union leaders were brought to Texas to observe the November 1990 state and local election process.

(5) The regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO train local unionists in leadership, organizational skills, negotiation and collective bargaining techniques, thus providing knowledge about the workings of democracy and imparting democratic values on trainees.

In societies that have had little historical or recent experience with democracy, training programs sponsored by the regional labor union institutes ~~might~~ include subjects as basic as how to hold a meeting, how to abide by principles of majority rule, how to elect a shop steward, how to approach management, how to elect a union leadership, what qualities to look for in a good leader, how to keep the union leadership responsive to its constituency and sensitive to the needs of the rank and file, how to negotiate with management and engage in collective bargaining, what is the proper role of free trade unions is in a democratic society, etc. (See Appendix C for examples of courses offered by AIFLD at the George Meany Center and for brief course descriptions as they appear in the AIFLD brochure.) Beyond the nuts-and-bolts of unionism, such courses are intended to assist members in achieving financial independence for their organizations and instruct them in the principles of representation and democracy.

At the more advanced level, training might include more sophisticated or specialized courses on research and data collection; labor economics; the development of local, national, regional and international policies and strategies; or on possible responses to structural adjustment policies enacted by governments. Through such advanced course-work, unionists learn to participate on a more equal footing with employers and government representatives in the formulation of national economic policy. For example:

"...[I]n the wake of structural adjustment, AALC has begun

22
to emphasize economic training and research. By doing so, it responds to an important need for knowledgeable and effective labor representation in the halls of power where crucial economic decisions are being made at the prompting of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and other donors."²⁵

Such training courses ^{CAN} serve the cause of democracy by teaching free trade unionists to mobilize and exercise power, thereby offsetting or tempering the power of the government. In a 1987 evaluation of AAFLI's programs in Asia, the team reported that:

"The Bangladesh Seaman's Association, a very large BFTUC affiliate, informed the team that their extensive involvement in AAFLI training has helped them deal more effectively with the government-run hiring hall, and to help reduce corruption in the operation of the hiring hall."²⁶

With respect to training leaders or providing unionists with skills necessary for effective leadership, consider the following example from the Philippines:

"...[T]he TUCP union leaders claim the senatorial nomination and candidacy of Ernesto "Boy" Herrera as an AAFLI-supported achievement. They assert Herrera's recognition as a solid leader of a legitimate, viable trade union organization would have been impossible without (1) AAFLI-supported training courses which sharpened leadership and organizing skills, and (2) most importantly, AAFLI support to the TUCP itself which has maintained and strengthened the Congress."²⁷

The courses are designed to impart democratic values on participants and to provide participants with training in democratic principles. The unions, in turn, provide the

opportunity to put some of those principles into practice. In this regard, it is important to remember that the unions themselves are political entities, operating in some countries as singular democratic microcosms. A 1979-80 evaluation of AIFLD activity in Chile indicated that:

*"Investments in human resource training made years ago are now paying off as leaders return to activity and currently elected officers look to the few AIFLD trained local leaders for guidance. Therefore, training in ideals and not just techniques provides a lasting residual effect."*²⁸

The final, extremely important function of training seminars, conducted under the sponsorship of the regional labor union institutes, is to inform workers of their rights under the law. Such a function becomes all the more crucial when workers lack the educational skills or the language competence to interpret the law, or when they lack access to such information. Reporting on training programs offered under the auspices of the AALC, through International Trade Secretariats (ITSs) in South Africa, a 1986 evaluation determined that:

*"... [U]nion members now know of their right to a 'board of inquiry' before their dismissal and of their right to contractual benefits, so that they bring to the attention of union leadership, wrongs and illegalities they have suffered which might otherwise have been accepted without protest. Likewise, more advanced training provided through the ITS in matters such as occupational health and safety have transmitted to rank and file members not only new information as to safety hazards and chemical dangers they face in their daily work, but also information as to recourse and redress available to those who have been victims of improper health and safety practices."*²⁹

(6) Free and democratic labor unions contribute to the promotion of human and civil rights both as part of their program to promote democracy and because their very existence depends on those rights.

When asked if their programs included the pursuit of human rights abroad, representatives of the regional labor union institutes uniformly responded that they make no distinction between human and civil rights on the one hand, and worker and labor rights on the other. After all, they argued, the establishment of free trade unions in a given society is rooted in the observance of certain fundamental rights. The official position of the AFL-CIO on this matter is as follows:

*"Freedom of association tends to get a lot less attention than such rights as freedom of the press or freedom of speech. Yet no right is more basic to democracy and the guarantee of fundamental human rights. Without the ability to associate freely and create our own organizations, working men and women have no means to defend the other fundamental rights of freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion. Similarly, the erosion of any of these rights gravely threatens freedom of association -- the bedrock of free trade unionism."*³⁰

In addition to a more standard list of human and civil rights, the AFL-CIO includes in its aims the pursuit of worker rights (the right to organize and bargain collectively, the right to a basic standard of occupational health and safety, the right to a guaranteed minimum wage, a prohibition of forced or compulsory labor, and restrictions on the employment of children). "There ought to be," argues Lane Kirkland, "at the forefront of a foreign policy worthy of the United States of America a new and steadfast commitment to the advancement of human rights, beginning with the basic rights of working people."³¹

Likewise, the AFL-CIO considers property rights, in the form of land titling, to be part of the process of building democracy. Ownership equals political empowerment. If a person owns his own land, he is a much freer political actor and no longer has to be dependent upon the landowner for whom he works. There are a number of land titling programs being pursued by the AFL-CIO regional institutes, with AID funding, especially in Latin America and Asia.³²

The regional trade union institutes have been involved directly in human rights training programs under FAA Section 116(e) and, in the case of AAFLI, have worked directly with human rights "Watch" groups. There are countless examples of the ways in which the regional labor union institutes are involved in the pursuance of human rights abroad, as well as of the overlap between human rights, as formally understood by the United Nations, and workers' rights, as defined by the International Labor Organization (ILO). For instance, when twenty-five female Bangladeshi garment workers died as the result of being locked in a factory where a fire occurred -- with an additional one hundred workers injured -- AAFLI embarked on a program for Bangladeshi women aimed at raising their awareness of their human and labor rights (especially regarding worker safety), providing information sessions over an eighteen month period of time in Dhaka.

*"In addition to educating working women on their rights, the seminars [were intended to] increase workers' knowledge of how to redress grievances through legal channels. Participants [were expected to] learn how legal, government and private institutions can assist workers in this process."*³³

The link between human and worker rights is likewise seen in the example of the Service Center of the Malaysian Trades Union Congress, sponsored by AAFLI, at which the rights of freedom of association, collective bargaining and recourse against illegal or arbitrary dismissal are pursued.³⁴

In effect, USAID has also recognized the link between human and worker rights, and has done so in providing AAFLI with a human rights grant, under section 116(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act, to help the All Indonesian Workers' Union (SPSI) pursue a program to ensure that the legal minimum wage standard be observed and that employers violating this standard be punished.³⁵

Another example of the human rights work of the regional labor union institutes was a project undertaken by AALC, in 1989, in response to the ongoing civil war in Sudan. The AALC held four meetings to discuss the ways in which the Sudanese trade unions could participate peacefully in the resolution of the problems of Southern Sudan -- problems that revolved around human rights issues regarding the incompatibility of certain ethnic and religious groups.

In addition to the fact that human and labor rights are an intrinsic part of the program of free labor unions, the regional labor unions institutes pursue such issues when trade union activists abroad become victims of kidnappings, torture, disappearances and murders, instigated by either the left or the right, by the military, by the police, or by employers. The Philippines is one example among many. In response to such violations of human and civil rights, AAFLI applied for and received a special human rights grant from USAID, to hold a series of conferences and workshops on human rights in the Philippines. These meetings were intended to: (a) raise awareness of the importance of civil and political rights in a democratic society; (b) help the Trade Union Congress of the Philippines to lobby the government to establish stricter mechanisms for the punishment of violence; and (c) bring together members of the labor movement, military, police, local and national government and the judiciary to discuss a comprehensive approach to the problem of human and civil rights.³⁶

On a broader scale, human rights issues are pursued by the regional labor union institutes through diplomatic

channels, as was the case when AAFLI provided Richard Schifter, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, prior to his recent visit to the People's Republic of China, with a list of Chinese worker activists who had been imprisoned for political reasons. Schifter later reported that Chinese officials had accepted the list.³⁷

Likewise, the regional labor union institutes and the International Affairs Department of the AFL-CIO pursue the issues of human and worker rights through their participation in international labor forums, including the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (that publishes a yearly survey of violations of trade union rights around the world) and the International Labor Organization.

(7) Labor unions^{CAN} provide alternative sources of information in developing countries through the publication of union newspapers and journals.

Access to information is a hallmark of democracy, whether one is talking about freedom of speech, freedom of the press, journalism, research, or access to the media. As such, accurate information is crucial to the functioning of free and democratic trade unions.

The regional labor union institutes serve a variety of functions when it comes to information. They have, on numerous occasions, provided free trade unionists abroad with the physical equipment needed for union communications. For example, even before FTUI was active in assisting free trade unions in Central and Eastern Europe; i.e., before the communist regimes in those countries began to fall in late 1989, the AFL-CIO was providing printing presses, paper and ink to the underground Solidarity trade union -- assistance that was enormously important to the survival of that

union.³⁸ In less developed countries, printing presses are frequently provided by the regional labor union institutes to unions, as they are so crucial an instrument for the effective functioning of mass organizations. In Senegal, for example,

"The purchase of a printing press in 1986 has permitted the CNTS (Confederation National de Travailleurs du Senegal) to publish a regular newspaper, as well as a variety of other pamphlets, flyers, brochures and documents of interest to its members. It has made possible the publication of labor-management agreements so that their provisions can be publicized among the workers."³⁹

Broadcast communication likewise is seen as essential to the effective function of unions, as evidenced by the fact that AAFLI contributed AFL-CIO funds to a radio station in the Philippines to assure quick repair of damages that resulted from the November 1990 typhoon.⁴⁰

As part of their educational programs, the regional labor union institutes train publication and information specialists in how to communicate effectively with union members, and how to communicate with the society at large. In some countries, the regional institutes have established union research centers where union researchers collect labor statistics and gather the information they need to develop sound and well-founded political positions. For example, in the Philippines, AAFLI supports the staff salaries, publications and workshops at the TUCP's (Trade Union Congress of the Philippines) Research Department. That department maintains an extensive library on labor problems, and issues numerous reports and position papers on labor topics. But such research centers are especially important in single-party states or in countries where workers fundamentally distrust their government's ability to collect and disseminate accurate information.⁴¹ In a similar

vein, the AALC, in 1985-86, helped to support a journal called Labor and Development and a newsletter entitled African Trade Union News, which were put out by CREDE (the French acronym for the Regional Center for Economic Research and Documentation located in Lome). These publications, printed in both French and English, were distributed to unionists, labor ministers, and government officials.⁴² The AALC also assisted in the establishment of a very successful union paper in Sudan that now, under current circumstances, can no longer be published in country. It continues to be printed, however, in London (with funds from NED) for eventual distribution in Sudan.

Union-to-Union Programs

The AFL-CIO is not itself a union, but a federation of unions. Through its regional labor union institutes, it operates abroad on a federation-to-federation level. There is a separate system, called the Union-to-Union Program, through which individual unions can cooperate with their peers of the same "trade". Under this configuration, industry-specific unions are affiliated into large International Trade Secretariats, based in Brussels and, themselves, affiliated with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). It is through this system, for example, that the teachers of Poland are able to get assistance from the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) in a program designed to help them overhaul school curricula (particularly in history and civics) to reflect Poland's new democratic order.⁴³

Under this system, and using the Polish example, the teachers in Poland, in conjunction with the AFT, submitted a proposal and a budget for this program to the ITS for teachers -- in this case, the International Federation of Free Teachers Unions (IFFTU). The IFFTU, in turn, submitted the proposal to the Free Trade Union Institute that decided,

in screening any number of proposals, to fund this project. The money for the project then went from FTUI to the IFFTU. The ideological critics of the AFL-CIO refer to such processes as "funneling money" for dubious purposes, and indeed, the money does change institutional hands a number of times. But the reasons for it are really quite fair, in that it prevents nationally-based union federations from dealing individually with trade unions in other countries -- an activity that is considered politically "inappropriate".⁴⁴

These union-to-union programs have several additional advantages. They provide industry-specific expertise where needed (teachers-to-teachers, metalworkers-to-metalworkers), as well as industry-specific networks of support. Even the People's Daily World, a publication of the American Communist Party, applauded the work of the AFL-CIO for the assistance offered to Brazilian workers, through the union-to-union program, for contract negotiations, with Union Carbide, that had come to a halt.⁴⁵

These programs also simplify the possibilities of union exchanges and encourage American union leaders, as well as the rank-and-file, to take part in activities with their peers abroad. These are considered more "specialized" programs and are common in, although not exclusive to, countries where labor does not need assistance in the most rudimentary matters of unionization (how to hold a meeting, how to elect a leader, etc.), such as in South Africa.

Just as on the level of federation-to-federation, these union-to-union programs devote many of their activities to issues of democratization, such as developing national legislation to protect workers in a given industry, and then developing a strategy to get the legislation passed.

SECTION 3**CASE STUDIES**

The case studies presented in this section are provided as examples of the types of programs for democracy the AFL-CIO, through each of its four regional labor union institutes, sponsors internationally. The countries included -- Poland, Botswana, Thailand, and Venezuela -- are organized in the report from the newest to the oldest in the international "free trade union" portfolio of the AFL-CIO.

None of the countries described is meant to be representative of a region. Nor can they be defined exclusively as exceptions. The quality that brings them together here is the fact that they portray some of the democratic successes linked to the American labor movement, through programs funded largely by US/AID.

Each case study includes a description of (1) the state of democracy in that country; (2) the state of the labor movement; (3) the relationship between the labor movement and national government; and finally (4) the types of programs being pursued in that country by the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO.

POLAND

In this century, Poland's experience with democracy has been limited in time to the interwar period (1920-1939) and limited in scope to semi-democratic, operating largely under the rule of authoritarian figures. Following the Second World War, the communist party (not a relevant indigenous movement, but rather one imported from the Soviet Union) consolidated its forces and ruled Poland until 1989. ✓

Even under communist rule, independent movements for liberalization or democratization had a long and rich history in Poland. The largest movement and the one that had the most profound impact not only on Poland, but on the regions as a whole, was the Independent and Self-Governing Trade Union Solidarity. This social movement, that took the

form of a trade union, had its beginning in the Lenin Shipyard in Gdansk in August 1980, gained legal recognition in November 1980, grew in size to include some eleven million members (out of a population that then numbered 36 million), was forced into the underground with the declaration of martial law in 1981, and was legally banned in the fall of 1982. For most of the 1980s, Solidarity operated clandestinely. Together with the majority of the population of Poland, the union upheld a virtual stalemate against the martial law government, refusing to cooperate in building a new social, economic and political order. Finally, in February 1989, the government agreed to negotiate with Solidarity and held roundtable talks that resulted in the following concessions: (1) the government agreed to allow Solidarity to compete for one-third of the seats in the Polish Parliament (the Seym) and for all one hundred seats in a newly created Senate; (2) a new Prime Minister was to be appointed by General Jaruzelski who, himself, was to retain his position as an interim President of Poland.

The free elections held in Poland in 1989 resulted in a victory for Solidarity which won all of the seats in the Seym and all but one in the newly created Senate. Although General Jaruzelski was to appoint a Prime Minister, the nomination he put forth met with such vehement objections that a Solidarity Prime Minister was finally confirmed (Tadeusz Mazowiecki). Also, due to strong popular opposition toward President Jaruzelski and to splits that occurred between Prime Minister Mazowiecki and Solidarity leader Lech Walesa, popular elections for president were held ahead of schedule, in late 1990, and Lech Walesa himself emerged victorious and Mazowiecki resigned his commission.

Although Poland's Solidarity movement led the way to the collapse of communism in Central and Eastern Europe in 1989, its system of government lags behind most of the

region with regard to progress toward democracy. The Seym has yet to be freely elected, with two-thirds of the parliamentary deputies remaining as holdovers from the communist regime. This majority of deputies represents, at best, only a tiny minority of Poland's electorate.

The Labor Movement in Poland

In the interwar period, some 2000 labor organizations (dividing workers along lines of industry, enterprise, political preference, and ethnicity) and 300 trade unions existed in Poland.⁴⁶ Labor strikes became popular weapons and Poland's workers were considered among the most militant in the world. In the period between 1926 and 1936 only the United States and France had more strikes and strikers than did Poland.⁴⁷

The situation of numerous, small, militant trade unions was intolerable to the new postwar socio-political order, and as early as December 1945 the unions were collapsed into eighteen massive organizations.⁴⁸ These organizations more closely resembled Lenin's formula for communist trade unions which were to serve as schools of communism, activating and mobilizing workers to build the new order. In addition, they were to act as transmission belts, transmitting policy from the polity to the masses.

But the militancy of the Polish workers was never "adequately" harnessed and labor strikes were more common in communist Poland than in any other of the Soviet Bloc countries (worker strikes that drew world attention occurred in Poznan 1956; Gdansk and Szczecin 1970-71; Radom and Ursus 1976; national strikes whose epicenter was Gdansk in 1980; and many smaller strikes throughout the martial law period, culminating in the two months preceding the roundtable talks of 1989, when more than 300 wildcat strikes took place). It was a fairly common theory in the 1970s and 1980s that the Soviet Union had not invaded Poland since the Second World War because it feared Polish workers.

Eventually, it was the Solidarity labor movement, under the leadership of Lech Walesa, that led to the first freely held elections in the region for a limited number of positions within the Polish government and it was Lech Walesa who was freely elected to the office of President of the new Republic of Poland.

Relations between the Labor Unions and the Polish Government

There are, in fact, two labor union movements in Poland today: the larger is the OPZZ federation with a membership of 4.5 million; the smaller is Solidarity with 2.3 members.⁴⁹ Their relationship to the current Polish government is both complicated and bizarre. To begin with, both union organizations continue to operate under a law established in 1982 (shortly after the declaration of martial law) that makes the staging of legal strikes so difficult, as to preclude them altogether. While in a democratic society, such a law would need to be quickly abolished, it is not entirely clear to the Polish government whether making worker strikes easier to stage is entirely desirable at this difficult point in Poland's economic transformation. Perhaps even more to the point is the fact that wildcat strikes are so common in Poland, by both the OPZZ and Solidarity, that the 1982 law is all but irrelevant.

OPZZ was the creation of martial law and was established by the Jaruzelski government once martial law restrictions on trade unions were lifted. It, in fact, represents a reconstituted communist federation of unions. It has enormous assets (valued at some \$21.4 million in 1985) that represent a combination of money and goods transferred from the old communist union structure (the CRZZ) and cash and equipment confiscated from Solidarity when martial law was declared. It also has control over a network of vacation spas and sanatoria, all of which afford it the reputation of being the union organization one joins

when seeking material benefits. Its relationship to the current Polish government is adversarial and confrontational, and it mobilizes its membership to oppose the recent programs for economic reform arguing that they are being implemented at the direct expense of Polish workers. ✓

Solidarity, on the other hand, controls far fewer assets and is considered the movement to join for representation and leadership,⁵¹ i.e., certainly not for material benefits. With Lech Walesa's election to the Presidency of Poland in December 1990, Solidarity's newly elected chairman, Marian Krzaklewski has been left with the union's difficult dilemma: whether to support the government's economic reform program, which indeed must be carried out at great expense to Polish workers (in terms of unemployment and forfeited wage increases) or to concern itself exclusively with the representation of the interests of its constituency and to do so at the expense of the economic reforms. This dilemma typifies the inherent tension between certain levels of economic and political development.

Among the organizational reforms Solidarity is currently undertaking is one that intends to shift the points of power away from its 38 geographic regions to its more than 70 occupational branches -- a change that it claims is better suited to Poland's economic reform efforts and one that would be modeled more closely after Western trade unions.⁵¹ Solidarity's branch unions are now the more radical elements within the organization and, at times, they have competed against each other for limited resources. With the reorganization, leaders of the 15 secretariats that group together the more numerous branches would be coopted onto Solidarity's National Commission.⁵² But such a reorganization would also suit the broader regional goals of the AFL-CIO's Free Trade Union Institute in that it would allow the vehemently anti-communist Solidarity branches a

vote in the European arena of the International Trade Secretariats (the ITSs).

FTUI-Sponsored Labor Union Programs in Poland

The AFL-CIO's relationship with Solidarity began long before Poland embarked on its transition to a democratic society in 1989. Even prior to the birth of the independent labor movement in 1980, AFL-CIO representatives were meeting quietly and unofficially with the tiny underground Free Trade Union Cells that eventually formed the basis of the mass movement of workers.⁵³ Lane Kirkland was a very vocal and demonstrative supporter of Solidarity as it emerged in the Lenin Shipyards in August 1980, even amidst protests by the Carter administration that Kirkland's actions -- especially his public presentation of large sums of money to the newly emerging labor union -- might be interpreted by the communist leadership of Poland as meddling in a sovereign nation's internal affairs. Kirkland said he did not care.

Following the imposition of martial law in Poland in December 1981, an action that included massive arrests of Solidarity leaders, the AFL-CIO and later the Free Trade Union Institute undertook the task of providing support for Solidarity's underground movement. In cash and equipment, the AFL-CIO and FTUI provided a life-line to the clandestine operations of that union organization. To say that it was largely American labor that financed underground Solidarity through the 1980s is no exaggeration.⁵⁴ Solidarity activists throughout Poland, in urban and rural areas alike, are familiar with the contributions of American labor, oftentimes through first-hand experience. By the mid- to late 1980s, "American trade union funds and millions of dollars from the National Endowment for Democracy ... were channeled through the AFL-CIO's Free Trade Union Institute" into Poland.⁵⁵ For two consecutive years, 1988 and 1989, Congress appropriated \$1 million through FTUI to Solidarity. By 1990, that appropriation reached nearly \$1.5 million.

Today, the Free Trade Union Institute has several ongoing programs in support of Solidarity. The largest by far (\$1.49 million of a total of \$1.69 million) is for direct assistance to the Solidarity trade union and is earmarked largely for rebuilding the union's infrastructure; i.e., for the purchase of office equipment for national and regional level union offices (oftentimes as a replacement for equipment confiscated from Solidarity after its legal status was revoked with the declaration of martial law), and for printing equipment for union publishing endeavors. This money was also used to help pay the expenses of Solidarity's Second Congress (April 1990). In addition, several educational/vocational projects are being undertaken on these funds (including financial help for the Center for Social and Vocational Studies and training in the basics of democratic trade unionism); civic action programs whose focus is on municipal and local council elections; and international exchange programs and cooperative activities between Solidarity and foreign trade unions.

There are four additional programs under the sponsorship of the Free Trade Union Institute. The first is support (\$75K) for the "Economic Foundation of Solidarity" -- a special foundation created to assist Polish workers in making the transition from a centralized to a decentralized economy. The foundation provides training programs in business and management, as well as direct aid to unionists in need.

A second program has provided \$45K in assistance to Rural Solidarity for the purpose of (a) training union organizers from each of Poland's forty-nine provinces and affording them the background to serve as future trainers; (b) developing an exchange program between Polish, American and West European farmers; and (c) improving communications between members of Rural Solidarity by expanding their newspaper operations.

The final two projects are Union-to-Union programs,

organized by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). One is a program, started in 1989, called "Education for Democracy" whose objectives are to provide basic course materials in history and the principles and practices of democracy, as well as to encourage the development of democratic structures in schools. The other is a program, also organized by the AFT, on democratic institution-building. Here, the AFT conducted four one-week seminars, each with 25 participants, for local and national leadership in Teachers' Solidarity in Poland. The seminars were to hold sessions on democratic institutions, local organizations, organizing, recruitment, communications and pedagogy. These programs received, respectively, \$40K and \$34K from AID. To date, none of the FTUI programs in Eastern Europe has been evaluated.

BOTSWANA

Botswana is the only country in Africa that has held democratic elections for the past twenty-five years, uninterrupted by the imposition of authoritarian rule.⁵⁶ Since gaining its independence in 1966, Botswana has functioned as a parliamentary republic with five political parties, only one of which, the Botswana Democratic Party (BDP), has ruled continuously for the past quarter of a century. This is not to imply that Botswana's democracy is very stable or pure in form. The government system of patronage, for example, offers numerous jobs to people at all levels, down to the village, thereby ensuring the subsequent re-election of the BDP. Still, the BDP's political record is good and its economic accomplishments real.

At independence, Botswana "boasted" 3 kilometers of paved roads and was listed as one of the world's poorest countries. Today, Botswana is considered to be the economic

miracle of Africa with a Gross Domestic Product of \$1.5 billion, Per Capita Income of more than \$1,300, and an external debt significantly less than \$0.5 billion. This economic miracle is rooted in Botswana's mineral wealth which includes copper, nickel, diamonds, coal, soda ash, salt and potash.

The rapid pace of economic development has attracted rural dwellers to the cities by the thousands, in search of jobs and housing, and taxing the school and water systems. The scarcity of semi-skilled entry-level jobs and the need for technical expertise have created an increasing disparity between rich and poor.

Still, eighty percent of Botswana's 1.2 million people live off of subsistence farming. Cattle is a major industry, with the ratio of cattle to people at three-to-one in Botswana.

The Labor Movement in Botswana

At independence, the trade union movement in Botswana was unstructured and had a history of rising and falling as personalities and situations changed. The only viable union in the country, with a history of activism, was in the railroad industry. But even this union was a secondary partner to the stronger Rhodesian railway union.

In 1969, the government of Botswana passed a Trade Union Act which legitimized existing trade unions and authorized the formation of new ones. In 1977, the Botswana Trade Union Federation (BFTU) was established and today remains the only federation of trade unions in the country, representing 35,000 workers (about one in three members of the country's "organizable workforce") in twelve affiliate unions. Some national unions remain unaffiliated.

The BFTU is an active member of the Southern African Trade Union Coordination Council (SATUCC), a regional trade union body; the Organization of African Trade Union Unity (OATUU), a pan-Africa trade union organization; and the

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), a world body of trade unions. Thus, it is a legitimate actor in the national, continental, and international labor scene.

Relations between the Labor Unions and the Government of Botswana

In the past, the labor movement has been viewed with suspicion by the government of Botswana. A 1989 evaluation by the consulting firm Development Associates, included the following observation: "Vice President (and former Labor Commissioner) Peter Mmusi told the team that GOB officials scored the BFTU, and Botswana labor leaders generally, for immaturity and a lack of dedication. He also questioned union contributions to the national economy. His remarks highlighted the often bumpy road the unions have been forced to travel in Botswana, where highly conservative economic and fiscal policies have been the norm and the government has been markedly pro-business."⁷

"Bumpy" as it may have been, it has also been described by observers as generally peaceful. One of the major handicaps under which unions in Botswana operate today, is the law that prohibits them from being granted free time from work for union business. The law stipulates that union officers must be full-time employees of their industry. Therefore, in order to attend a meeting, perhaps in another town, a union leader is forced to seek his employer's permission to take time off from work. Such a law precludes the development of a cadre of professional union leaders.

AALC-Sponsored Labor Union Programs in Botswana

The AALC took up residence in Botswana in late 1969. The office was originally intended to serve as a regional base for AALC representation in Lesotho, Swaziland, South Africa and Botswana. By May of 1970, the first AALC-sponsored worker education course took place for rank and file members. Two years later, with the assistance of

the AALC, the Botswana Trade Union Education Center (BTUEC) was built and, by year's end, had trained over 1,000 workers in the basics of trade unionism.

One of the earliest Union-to-Union programs sponsored by the AALC brought mining specialists from the United Steel Workers of America to Botswana. Through the development of sophisticated bargaining postures, along with the mineworkers' dynamic leadership, the union in Botswana succeeded in getting a stop order facility (dues check-off) based on a percentage of salary, access into the mines to meet their members and resolve problems, and paid leave time for trade union education programs. The end result was an efficient union, supported by its members and, in return, capable of supporting itself as an organization.

The railway union, on the other hand, with a much smaller work force and ^{with} no promise of expansion, spread from Lobatse in the south beyond Francistown in the north. Servicing these members was impossible. To overcome this situation, the union negotiated a free rail pass for its leadership. This allowed the full-time unionist to travel the tracks, disembark at each station, and handle the needs of the workers or conduct programs for them. The AALC annually supported a series of seminars up and down the rail line, particularly during the period when Botswana was negotiating "sole ownership" of the railway line with the government of Zimbabwe. ✓

In 1983, the AALC negotiated an agreement between the BFTU and the Occupational Health Unit of the Ministry of Health to conduct a series of seminars throughout the country on health and safety. The immediate success of the program was the information it imparted to the trade union participants and the exposure it gave to the federation. Most important was the realization, by the ministry and government, that the BFTU was a serious organization capable of delivering programs, participants, and the needed funding.

Today the BFTU has a job creation/cooperative scheme, initiated by the AALC, which grows and sells vegetables; a day care center; a mobile canteen to provide hot lunches to workers; a Workers' Service Organization, started by the AALC, to provide secretarial service to the federation and its affiliates, as well as to generate income by providing these services to the general public; a Migrant Labor Project to assist in the transition of miners and their families entering and exiting South Africa; and computers and training, provided by the AALC, to assist the credit unions of trade unions.

In 1990, the AALC engaged in three major programs with the BFTU. Grants for union activity by the AALC in Botswana have never exceeded \$90,000 and program funds for FY-1990 were supplemented with money from Impact Project Funds and the AFL-CIO. (For FY-1991, AID funding allocated by the AALC to Botswana totals \$74,000.) 3

The first program was an external evaluation of the federation -- its organization, structure and programs. This was a professional evaluation done to take an accounting of the projects and programs of the affiliates and branches throughout the country in order to determine, on the one hand, how to streamline operations and, on the other, how best to proceed with future activities. Money from other donors was solicited and received, making this evaluation a cooperative effort.

The second program involved bringing to Botswana an American safety and health expert to review the program of the Health Unit and to conduct seminars on health and safety issues. The Health Unit, established with the help of the AALC in 1983, is an operating body of the BFTU. Its importance can be easily ^{deduced} ~~deducted~~ from the fact that Botswana's major industries include agriculture -- and especially cattle -- and mining. Thus, the U.S. expert in health and safety was in Botswana as a technical advisor, and the Health Unit undertook conducting seminars on health

and safety issues in slaughter houses, the skinning and tanning industry, hygiene and agriculture, and mining. The health and safety issues, as such, are basic. More advanced seminars then take those needs and translate them into collective bargaining issues.

The third program brought a U.S. labor economist to Botswana for a high level seminar on the Incomes Policy Bill that was then before parliament. The government of Botswana was in the process of restructuring its incomes policy and the labor economist brought in by the AALC helped the BFTU put together a position paper on the topic, to be presented at the tripartite committee. As it stood, the government's version of the Incomes Policy Bill would have tightly constrained the trade unions' ability to negotiate with the government, since all incomes would be set in advance. In addition, the policy would have established incomes for all occupations in the government sector and then called upon the private sector to follow suit. Such an Incomes Policy would have had two adverse effects on labor. First, it would have severely constrained labor's ability to engage in collective bargaining and it would have prevented workers from achieving wage increases based on productivity (especially relevant to Botswana's miners). Second, it would have promoted a shortage of skilled workers in the economy by keeping wages artificially low, thereby encouraging those workers to seek employment elsewhere, including outside the borders of Botswana.

As a result of this program, the government relaxed its wage constraints, severed the connection between wages in the public and private sectors, and safeguarded the future of collective bargaining. The government of Botswana has asked that this program be repeated again next year. Future seminars are to focus on how workers can best operate in this new arena, i.e., within the context of renewed opportunities for collective bargaining.

THAILAND

Among Thailand's most distinguishing characteristics within Southeast Asia is the fact that it never was subjected to colonial rule. This means that Thailand never experienced the imposition of Western institutions; never had its traditional structures disrupted or the texture of its social fabric destroyed; and never had occasion to mobilize mass social movements for independence -- all experiences that would have provided some of the underpinnings for the development of a stable democratic system with a well-developed civic culture.⁵⁸ While nominally a monarchy, the political system of Thailand in the late twentieth century can best be defined by its military rule with only brief interludes of democracy. On February 23, 1991, Thailand's military staged its most recent coup d'etat, toppling a democratically elected government. Even so, democracy in Thailand had not been regarded as "a purely political rule and process, but a political system in which the military and bureaucratic forces largely determine[d] the role as well as the mode of participation of the nonbureaucratic forces."⁵⁹ While the U.S. government, in response to this latest coup, has cut off all direct military and economic aid to Thailand, indirect aid through private voluntary associations, such as the American labor movement, has not been discontinued.⁶⁰

A second characteristic that has distinguished Thailand not only among its neighbors, but also in the world arena, has been its very high growth rate over the past two decades, and especially in the past few years. These socioeconomic gains have not been distributed equally, but rather have widened the gap between rich and poor and between rural and urban dwellers.⁶¹ More relevant to our concerns is the fact that this development has resulted in the rapid growth of the manufacturing sector, a five-fold increase in the number of factories between 1960 and 1980

and, of course, the swelling of the ranks of urban wage earners.⁶²

The Labor Movement in Thailand

Trade unions were outlawed in Thailand between 1958 and 1972, at which point they reemerged for about three years and then were outlawed again.⁶³ Where worker organizations existed, they primarily took the form of trade associations until 1975 when the Labor Relations Act was passed thereby legalizing the establishment of a more broadly based trade union movement. Today, only a minority of workers are organized into unions and the Thai labor movement is widely split between five major centers or federations. Of those five, the Asian-American Free Labor Institute (AAFLI) has worked with two: the Thai Trade Union Congress (TTUC) and the Labor Congress of Thailand (LCT). In addition to splits between federations, Thai labor unions are also divided between public and private. State enterprise unions have constituted the largest, most powerful and most coordinated trade union movement in Thailand, organizing 150,000 members in 98 affiliated unions.⁶⁴ These state enterprise unions have included a host of ("non-essential") unions such as textile workers, glass workers, and tobacco workers who chose to remain within the state enterprise system because it offered them exclusivity in their trade (i.e., the right to maintain a monopoly), even though they did not enjoy the right to strike. By comparison, private sector unions were smaller in size and less well organized. Both types of unions, state and private, were members of nationally organized federations, including the two with which AAFLI cooperates.

Relations between the Labor Unions and the Thai Government

Prior to the February 1991 coup, the relations between the Thai government and labor were, generally speaking, like those in any other democratic society. One qualification, —

however, was that their role was mainly consultative (with regard to labor relations) and did not afford them direct access to the mechanisms of political decision-making.⁶²

Under the new orders of the National Peacekeeping Council (the NPC), the Labor Relations Act of 1975 has been amended. Unions within the TTUC and LCT federations have had their right to strike severely restricted. Unions must now seek government permission to assemble and trade union officers must be full-time employees of the industry they represent. Hence, union responsibilities can be handled only after work-hours. In the past, Thai unions had been able to get around such restrictions on their elected officials by hiring union advisors or counselors who were paid by the union and functioned as full-time officers. Since the coup, additional restrictions have been added. For example, much shorter terms are now required of office holders and bureaucratic entanglements regarding union leadership have increased dramatically.

The state enterprise unions have been banned altogether. This has been done as a precursor to planned privatization of these industries. While the AFL-CIO and AAFLI do not oppose privatization in and of itself, there is deep concern over the motive behind the planned action, as it seems that those currently in power are also the ones whose financial status would allow them to purchase these industries, leading to a situation in which current monopoly-run segments of the society would be privately held. For the time being, state enterprise unions will be transformed into common trade associations, with no right to strike or to bargain collectively. Those refusing to reorganize into such association will lose all of their rights.

AAFLI-Sponsored Labor Union Programs in Thailand

AAFLI began working in Thailand in 1972 and, by 1975, assigned a full-time director to work in that country

following the passage of the 1975 Labor Relations Act.⁶⁶ On the whole, AAFLI programs have focused on education and training, labor organizing, research, cooperative development, membership services, Union-to-Union programs, international exchange programs (funded by USIA), and publications support.⁶⁷

There are currently two major AAFLI-sponsored labor union programs underway in Thailand. The first is a program sponsored by the AID mission in Bangkok and the second by AID/Washington.

Program #1: "Worker Participation in the Government Decision-Making Process"

This is a three-year program, begun on October 1, 1990, at a total projected cost of \$1,006,992 -- of which \$818,212 was requested and received from the AID mission in Thailand. Its stated goal is to:

Enhance the capability of the Thai Labor Movement to assess and articulate the interests of workers to the public and to effectively and responsibly channel these interests into the government decision-making process to achieve concrete problem resolution.

The program has three objectives, each of which is in turn operationalized into several component activities.

Objective #1 - Labor Think Tank: Support the establishment of a broadly-based Labor Think Tank that will assist the Thai Labor Movement to develop well-reasoned policy initiatives on national issues affecting workers.

Under this objective, the following activities are enumerated: (1) the appointment of a Thai economist to serve as a full-time research coordinator; (2) quarterly planning and evaluation meetings attended by labor leaders,

academics, and other interested parties; (3) the awarding of grants to support individual research projects aimed at formulating policy recommendations on issues affecting workers; (4) publication of a quarterly newsletter; (5) purchase of a computer and software to be used for newsletter and other publications, as well as to develop a data base; (6) the holding of a series of multi-sector symposia on labor-related issues; (7) the holding of an inaugural conference during the second year of the program; and (8) a Parliamentary Labor Committee study visit to the United States.

Objective #2 - Political Participation: To strengthen the ability of urban wage earners to access the government decision-making process.

The concern here focuses on the political integration of Thai urban wage earners. Most of the new workers in Bangkok come from Thailand's rural north and do not know how to transfer their voter registration to their new urban place of residence. In some cases, they simply do not know the relevant law. In other cases, workers concentrated in special dormitories have been subjected to political intimidation by their employers. Thus, portions of this program are devoted to educating workers about their need to change their voter registration from the rural north to Bangkok and to encourage them to list their union office, a counseling center or credit union, for example, as their place of residence so as not to remain vulnerable to political manipulation at the employer-controlled housing.

Thus, under this program objective of strengthening access to government decision-making processes for urban wage earners, the following activities are listed: (1) the hiring of a labor liaison to work full-time coordinating activities aimed at enhancing political participation; (2) monthly voter education programs on how to transfer

residence, the importance of participating in elections and the ~~harmful effect~~ ^{harmful effect} of buying votes; (3) the production of a series of brochures on how to transfer residence; (4) the observation by Thai labor leaders of the 1992 elections in the U.S.; (5) a seminar for top union leaders on the role of political parties in decision making; (7) the hiring of an American consultant on unions and democracy to assist with the afore-mentioned seminar; (8) a seminar on the principles and practical skills of articulating the worker interests and on channeling those interests into the government decision-making process; (9) the hiring of an American consultant on accessing the political decision-making process to assist with the afore-mentioned seminar; (10) the production of a manual on participation in the political decision-making process, to be used by union leaders.

Objective #3 - Private Sector Union Development: Enhance the institutional capabilities of private sector unions in the areas of membership recruitment, collective bargaining, and the provision of services to improve the quality of life of their memberships at the workplace and in their communities.

The following are activities aimed at achieving this objective: (1) membership recruitment, including training, follow-up workshops and executive board training for new members; (2) collective bargaining including survey analysis of collective bargaining agreements, training programs for union negotiators, the hiring of an American consultant on collective bargaining to assist with above mentioned training program as well as with the preparation of the "how-to" manual, a follow-up training workshop for graduates of the unit on union negotiation, biannual meetings between union leaders and employers to discuss issues of concern, the production of a 'how-to' manual on bargaining skills and on a case study of bargaining procedures, the holding of a national symposium on collective bargaining and on the need -

to strengthen it in the private sector, and visits to the U.S. by two Thai labor leaders to observe how industrial bargaining works; (3) women's leadership development, including a seminar on the role of working women in the American labor movement, the hiring of an American consultant on the afore-mentioned seminar and a training program on union leadership for women; and (4) membership service development including the hiring of two social workers and/or psychologists to provide counseling services to members, counselor training, construction of a facility for counseling services, telephone hot-line services, provision of basic office equipment, and partial support for operating expenses.

Only a short time after this project was launched, Thailand's military staged a coup d'etat which has had a profoundly negative impact on the labor movement. Nevertheless, early indications of progress being made on this project point to the success in particular of the voter education program.

The second program is one that is being executed through AID/Washington. This particular program has four components. First, labor education, which includes workshops and seminars on leadership training, training labor educators, training executive boards/administrators of new unions, training in basic trade union principles, English language training, plus the production of labor education materials and conducting occupational safety and health research.⁶⁸ The second area is organizing and it includes holding monthly supervisory meetings for organizers, and training of new organizers.⁶⁹ The third component is labor participation and includes voter registration, support for a consultant on workers' rights, seminars on the role of trade unions in a democratic society, and symposia on issues of national importance.

Finally, the fourth component is service development and includes aiding unions in their membership service programs, including offering financial support for programs in international education, for counselors in counseling centers, child care center support, credit union leadership training, and coop development.

Another aspect of AAFLI's work in Thailand involves the Union-to-Union program. For example, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) has met in the past with Thai state enterprise unions to offer training assistance to these public sector organizations in their attempts to resist privatization. The International Ladies' Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) and the Textile Workers Asian Regional Organization (TWARO) have sponsored programs for union organizing in Thailand. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT), United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW), International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM) and the Communication Workers of America (CWA) all have had programs that involved Thai workers directly or that included them in internationally held conferences and symposia.'°

When asked to provide indicators of success in their work in Thailand, representatives from the Asian American Free Labor Institute point first to the fact that AAFLI-trained union organizers have been responsible for two-thirds of the new unions organized in the past two years. Moreover, they argue that unions and their federations are the only substantive broad-range organizations in Thailand that subscribe to and operate on democratic principles. Next, the longevity and institutionalization of the Thai labor movement is offered as a primary example of AAFLI's success in that country. During an AID audit in 1987, the U.S. Labor Reporting Officer indicated that AAFLI's accomplishment can be seen in that fact that there is no longer any talk by the Thai

government about whether Thai unions had the right to exist. Instead, Thai unions have become substantial and relevant players in the democratic processes of that country. Two final examples of project-specific successes were offered by AAFLI. The first was the support AAFLI gave to a day care center for the children of textile workers, which allowed more women to enter the labor force. The second was the aid provided by AAFLI for the establishment of credit unions. These credit unions offered workers a viable alternative to the otherwise common practice of borrowing money from extortionist money lenders.

The major challenge AAFLI faces is that presented by various Thai governments, both civilian and military. AAFLI representatives cite the recent coup and actions taken against state enterprise unions as evidence of these obstructionist forces. However, AAFLI maintains that despite these severe restrictions, the fact that all unions were not banned outright testifies to the fact of the staying power of the labor movement in Thailand. Fifteen years ago, actions taken against unions would have been far more severe.

VENEZUELA

In all of South America, Venezuela has the longest, most stable democracy, based on extensive popular participation, real competition, democratic institutions that last longer than a single generation, and strong leadership.¹ It is not without its critics and commentators who foretell the demise of Venezuelan democracy, describing the system as an "ossified party oligarchy" that "peddles influence and patronage" and employs an electoral system that operates in a "carnival atmosphere".² Nevertheless, Venezuela's democracy has

been continuous since 1958, the year in which the country's last military dictator, Perez Jimenez, was overthrown. It has overcome serious challenges from communist parties, and especially from Fidel Castro, and has been ruled by successive opposition parties while holding at bay the extremist, though legal, parties of the Right and Left. Yet, except for one brief period (1945-1948), Venezuelans had had no previous experience with mass democracy. Venezuela's success with its political system has many components^{'3} of which labor is only one part, and the single focus of this section of the report.

The Labor Movement in Venezuela

Venezuelan workers did not unionize until after the death of dictator Juan Vincente Gomez in 1935. Until that time, all attempts by workers to organize were systematically crushed. As such, Venezuelan workers were latecomers to the political scene in Latin America.^{'4} Their "late start" was then interrupted by a decade of military rule (1948-1958) during which time the military leadership attempted to extinguish all aspirations for democratic trade unionism. At first a series of decrees, ordered by the military junta, tried to break the back of the labor movement. This was followed by a wave of persecution that included the confiscation of union funds and property, the padlocking of union headquarters, disbanding of meetings, arrest of leaders, and finally physical torture for those who led protests against the repression.^{'5}

As early as December 1948, the International Labor Organization (ILO) and William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, registered official protests against the treatment of free trade unionists in Venezuela.^{'6} It was also over labor rights in Venezuela that George Meany and Walter Reuther, in 1955, issued their first joint statement in history, which read:

"We appeal to the conscience of all liberty-loving peoples in the Western Hemisphere to join us and the other democratic trade unions in urging the reestablishment of civil liberties, trade union rights, and the dignity of free labor in Venezuela and the release of the imprisoned free trade unionists."

Venezuela's brief experience with democracy had lasted only from 1945-1948, when it was under the democratic leadership, first, of Romulo Betancourt and, then, Romulo Gallegos. The American labor movement, through the AFL's Latin American Labor Ambassador, Serafino Romualdi, had established a relationship with the Venezuelan Confederation of Labor (CTV) in the 1940s, while Romulo Betancourt was Chief of State and head of the Accion Democratica (AD), a party of the democratic left. During the dark days that followed, when the country was under the dictatorship of Colonel Marcos Perez Jimenez, American labor maintained and nurtured its relationship with Betancourt, who had been exiled from Venezuela.

Betancourt's exile had taken him from Washington, D.C., to Cuba, to Costa Rica, to Puerto Rico, in part because of indecision by the State Department regarding the advisability of granting him political asylum. After all, in 1954, the Eisenhower administration had awarded the Legion of Honor to Perez Jimenez.⁷⁸ Throughout, American labor -- whether through the AFL, its labor attache, or the newly merged AFL-CIO -- defended the rights of trade unionism in Venezuela and remained firmly by Betancourt's side.

Venezuelan labor played a prominent role in the overthrow of Jimenez in 1958. By December 1959, Betancourt resumed the presidency of Venezuela as the candidate of Accion Democratica, in democratically held elections. Labor was his principal support. It was during Betancourt's administration that the CTV experienced one of its major

challenges from Castro's unions and "Fidelisimo", whose number one target was Venezuela.⁷⁹

Venezuela's democratic government made big progress in the 1960s in matters such as social reform, taxation, education, housing, land ownership and cultivation -- all with the strong backing of trade unions.⁸⁰ Strong trade unions resulted in the fact that employees of Bethlehem and U.S. Steel in Venezuela earned higher wages than did workers in comparable positions in some parts of Minnesota.⁸¹ Today, the CTV is a major actor in Venezuelan national politics, the country's largest federation of labor, and one of the strongest free trade union movements in all of Latin America. While most unions within the CTV represent a middle or left-of-middle road, unions on the far right and left, including Christian Democrats, Socialists and Communists, are also included.

Relations between Labor Unions and the Government of Venezuela

Labor was very much behind the election and re-election campaigns of Accion Democratica's Carlos Andres Perez. Accion Democratica, as well as other political parties in Venezuela, have their own trade union departments in which the principal labor unions in the country are represented for the purpose of bringing the issues of labor directly to the party. (Peru has a similar arrangement, albeit issues move in the other direction, i.e., from the top, down.) In addition, within the Venezuelan political system, a certain percentage of senatorial and congressional seats are reserved for labor union representatives. Thus, there is an institutionalized relationship between labor and government in Venezuela. Conversely, trade unions (as well as other major voluntary associations) generally elect their own leadership to proportionately represent the major competing political parties within the country.⁸² Such a system rather epitomizes the political dynamics of conflict and consensus.

AIFLD-Sponsored Labor Union Programs in Venezuela

The AFL-CIO and AIFLD in particular are proud of their relationship with the Venezuelan Confederation of Labor (CTV), and of their historical record of loyalty to Venezuelan democratic forces, even at times when such loyalty was out of sync with American foreign policy. The relationship that has been built between American and Venezuelan labor, however, was not achieved through U.S. government-sponsored programs of assistance, but rather through hard-core politics and long-term nurturing. AIFLD representatives point to the fact that the financial investment in Venezuela was minor, yet the relationship that developed is crucial to labor relations in all of Latin America.

In the past, AIFLD has helped the CTV in building a labor union school in Caracas. In the early 1960s, many of Venezuela's labor union leaders and members were trained in AIFLD-sponsored programs. In about 1970, AIFLD also assisted the CTV in establishing a "workers' bank" that became one of the largest financial institutions in the country and one through which unionists could receive low interest loans.

Venezuela is no longer a country slated for U.S. economic assistance. AIFLD's current programs with the CTV are therefore funded by the National Endowment for Democracy, with money provided by the U.S. Information Agency. The single, major ongoing program revolves around training Central Americans, and particularly Nicaraguans, in trade union democracy. Through this program, either Nicaraguans are brought to Caracas to attend classes at the CTV training center, or Venezuelans travel to Nicaragua to conduct classes. Nicaragua currently has four or five labor federations, and Venezuelan unionists are attempting to offer the CTV as a model through which Nicaraguan wage earners might position themselves in their new political

environment. Finally, the CTV also took a leading role in assisting the Nicaraguan labor federation, CUS, in preparing for the 1990 democratic elections. Educational programs, sponsored in part by AIFLD, and conducted by Venezuela's CTV, are currently being planned for Haiti.

SECTION 4**OTHER LABOR PROGRAMS**

Inter-American Foundation: Trade Union Education Institute

Since 1979, the Inter-American Foundation has been supporting the programs of the Trade Union Education Institute at the University of the West Indies. Before turning to the particulars of this Institute, a word about the structure of higher education in the West Indies will help to place this program into a broader context.

The University of the West Indies has three distinct campuses, each of which is funded by single state governments. Each campus has its own area of expertise: the Trinidad campus specializes in Agriculture; Barbados in Social Sciences; and Jamaica in Law. In addition to these campuses, the university runs an Extramural Department composed of small offices throughout the West Indies that serve as outreach units of continuing education programs and non-formal education. This Extramural Department is funded jointly by all countries, so that it has a certain regional -- rather than solely national -- reputation and credibility. The Trade Union Education Institute (TUEI) is one of three programs⁸³ offered through this department.

The TUEI was established in 1963 and the Inter-American Foundation (IAF) has been helping to support its programs with grants since 1979. In that year, the IAF gave the Institute \$300,000 -- a very large grant by IAF standards. A second large grant was provided in 1987 for the purpose of training teachers to provide courses on the role of trade unions in democratic societies.

To truly understand the justification for this project, one has to understand the structure and function of trade unions in the Caribbean, where the trade union movement preceded the establishment of political parties. In other words, political parties were the outgrowth of trade unions. The trade union movement itself is extremely segmented and, more or less, one's party affiliation is determined by one's trade union membership. Members from one trade union do not necessarily get along with members from another union.

Therefore, a single institute, such as the TUEI, brings together members from a variety of trade unions and countries in the hope of possibly improving inter-union relations as a by-product of participation in the courses.

What complicates the matter further is that trade unions are basically viewed as systems for the distribution of goods. Thus, unions need not concern themselves with worker rights or occupational safety, since union loyalty is essentially based on the expectation that certain scarce goods will be delivered. There is no particular expectation that worker interests will be represented. Union members, therefore, do not really know how they might use their unions to enhance their own economic, political and social well-being. Hence, the Trade Union Education Institute teaches unionists about the role of trade unions in a democratic society.

In addition, the TUEI teaches unionists how to solve problems resulting from rapid technological changes; provides skills and training to disadvantaged groups; and teaches union members about the role of trade unions in national and regional development. The particular program that the IAF funded was for women -- female Jamaican trade unionists. Its purpose was to provide women with the necessary skills to operate effectively in an organization (e.g., how to hold a meeting; how to elect a leaders, etc). To this end, it trained teachers, who in turn trained even more teachers. The 1987 grant provided for a series of four seminars at the regional level, with representatives from sixteen different countries. In all, there were about 150 participants. Each seminar lasted six days, for a total of forty hours. Then, back in their native countries, the original group of participants conducted sixteen national seminars, over a period of six days, with a total of 400 participants. Finally, those participants assisted in conducting thirty-two additional seminars at the parish level, lasting four days each, with a total of about 850

participants. The CCL (the regional organization of trade unions in the Caribbean) advertised the program regionally for the Trade Union Educational Institute.

The director of the TUEI is Rex Nettleford. He solicits funding for the Institute from IAF, European agencies, and the International Labor Organization (the ILO). By 1987, the Institute had trained 10,000 unionists. Today, that figure is probably closer to 12,000.

The evaluation done of the 1979 program sponsored by IAF was not very fruitful. It primarily addressed the question of how the women "felt" about the course they had taken, and the responses to this question were not particularly informative. There is an evaluation currently underway of the 1987 program. The evaluator has been contracted to conduct extensive interviews with some 400 participants of the seminars. That evaluation has not yet been completed.

Department of Labor: International Visitors Labor Studies Program

The Bureau of International Affairs at the U.S. Department of Labor provides yearly courses on labor relations for some 100 visitors from the Third World. Funding for this program is provided through the Agency for International Development.

Four or five courses are presented each year to a class of between 12 and 25 participants. In 1990, course topics included Labor Relations in a Democratic Society (Appendix D includes highlights from the course syllabus); Labor-Management Cooperation; Women's Issues in the Workplace; Labor's Role in Improving Productivity; and Labor Relations Aspects of Worker Safety and Health. In addition to lectures, participants meet with their counterparts in the U.S. and make site visits to select American institutions, agencies and businesses.

Participants for this program are selected, ideally, as tripartite teams, representing the private sector, labor unions, and government agencies (especially the Ministry of Labor). This is an aspect of the program to which the U.S. Department of Labor is particularly committed because oftentimes the Labor Studies Program represents the first occasion on which representatives from each of these sectors, in a given country, have gotten together to share in a common experience. The very fact of bringing these people together helps to make one of the major points that the Department of Labor hopes to impress upon participants: namely, that relations between various sectors in society need not be adversarial and that negotiations should be undertaken so that all sides win.

An evaluation of these Labor Studies Programs was completed by Management Systems International in October 1989⁸⁴ and provided glowing commentaries from 76 course graduates regarding the benefits of the training. These comments fell into four categories. Under the first, "referential use", participants indicated that the course provided them with general reference material; information that was useful for preparing speeches, reports, lectures, etc.; helped them prepare training courses upon their return home; and helped in negotiating contracts or in preparing for negotiations. In the second category, "information dissemination", course graduates reported that the training had increased their general knowledge of the subject matter; helped them to organize training at home; that the material was useful for purposes of persuasion; or that it was useful in reporting to supervisors. Under the third category, "networking", half the graduates interviewed indicated that they had benefitted from contacts made at the Department of Labor, at the academic institution or at the union they visited while in the U.S. or that they had had occasion, since finishing the training, to maintain contact with other course graduates. Finally, in the fourth

category, course graduates told of the benefits of the training in terms of policy, programs of procedural applications including contract negotiations and policy changes that they had helped to push forward in their our countries as a result of having completed the Labor Studies Program.

Other important outcomes of the courses provided by the U.S. Department of Labor included increased confidence on the part of participants upon their return home, increased responsibilities at one's job or a promotion, increased assertiveness in contract negotiation and heightened acceptance of the role of women in contract negotiations.

SECTION 5**DEMOCRACY AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE AFL-CIO**

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE AFL-CIO

Volumes have been written on the foreign policy of the AFL-CIO, many of which are required reading for even a basic understanding of its rich history and heated controversy. No short section of a report could ever pretend to do justice to the topic. Rather, the goal in these few pages is to highlight some of the issues in history and politics that may help to clarify the reasons behind much of the current debate, as it relates specifically to labor and democracy. Four separate topics are raised here: first, the unique aspects of American labor within an international context; second, an historical overview of the foreign policy of American labor, and criticisms of those policies; third, ideological splits within the American labor movement over issues of foreign policy; and fourth, recent changes in AFL-CIO political strategy.

But even before turning to these topics, one fact must be established clearly: namely, that foreign policy always has been and always will be of fundamental concern to the American labor movement. This foreign policy is governed by a single interest: the well-being of the American worker. It stands to reason that since the AFL-CIO depends on the American worker for its survival, that the worker should govern the federations's policies, directly or indirectly. Moreover, American labor is affected by policies made by governments at home and abroad:

*** Political and economic decisions on issues such as immigration law, export processing zones, or international copyright laws have a direct impact on the American worker, and a presidential "State of the Union" address that foretells of a free trade zone reaching from the Bering Sea to the Strait of Magellan, makes the American worker and the AFL-CIO shudder."⁵

*** Democracy and prosperity abroad are of interest to the American worker to the extent that they translate into a market for American-made goods.

*** Strong unions abroad translate into less attractive options for multinational corporations who seek to establish an industry in an environment of cheap Third World labor.

*** International observance of basic worker rights means, for example, that children cannot be employed abroad for pennies a day, at the expense of the American worker.

*** The creation of networks of mutual support between workers of different nations is also of interest to American workers.

Yet in this admittedly "self-serving" framework, the American labor movement has done much to promote democracy abroad, and promises to do much more, as the survival of the American worker increasingly depends on a stable, democratic and prosperous world environment.

The unique aspects of American labor in the international arena

The American labor movement has several characteristics that define its "exceptionalism" within the larger context of free labor unions internationally. First, it is pro-capitalist. While this may seem self-evident, this characteristic sets it apart not only from the remnants of the communist labor movement abroad, but also places it at odds with the socialist or leftist orientation of many of the free trade unions of Western Europe. Samuel Gompers, founder of the American Federation of Labor, felt that capitalism brought to a society the prosperity in which wage earners, through good organization and political strategy, would eventually share.

Second, the American labor movement has engaged in a form of organizational activity referred to as "business unionism",⁸⁶ intrinsically linked to its pro-capitalist orientation. Business unionism calls for cooperation between Business, Labor, and Government, using the instrument of collective bargaining as a means of peacefully

settling disputes. Business unionism, as a concept, is the antithesis of the "classist" theory of labor, that adheres to the belief that class antagonism is an inherent feature of the socio-political and economic order and that, therefore, workers and the owners of the means of production are natural enemies, whose motives and goals are irreconcilably different.

Finally, while the American labor movement has been traditionally linked with the Democratic party in the past (and certainly not exclusively so), it is, in its by-laws and its political endorsements, fundamentally non-partisan. This sets it apart from European labor movements, be they Social Democratic, Christian Democratic, Socialist or Communist, that are associated directly with parent political parties and who espouse specifically the political agendas of those parent organizations. This becomes important in "the field" as various international labor movements either compete or cooperate with each other in forming alliances in developing countries. This matter will be dealt with in more detail in a section on "issues" faced by the American labor movement in its promotion of democracy abroad.

An overview of the history of the foreign policy concerns of American labor

American labor has been promoting free trade unionism abroad since the Spanish-American civil war when, in 1898, Samuel Gompers, founder and head of the American Federation of Labor (AFL), sought to unionize Cuban, Puerto Rican and Filipino workers, fearing they would soon provide a cheap labor alternative to the American worker.⁴⁷ Since that time, many of the foreign policy objectives, first by the AFL, and later by the merged AFL-CIO have focused their efforts on Latin America. The targets of their objectives as well as their styles of operation have undergone a

lengthy and controversial evolution. Despite this enormously fascinating history, this brief report can name only some of the points worth keeping in mind in the broader context of labor and democracy.

The evolution, regarding Latin American policy, some argue, began with the two-fold need for increasing the standard of living in Latin American to the point that Latin Americans would be able to afford U.S. goods while, at the same time, keeping the relationship between Latin American labor and U.S. multinational corporations (particularly in the extractive industries or component manufacturing) congenial enough to ensure the plentiful supply of raw materials and parts from the South to North American manufacturers. The foreign policy of American labor invoked the Monroe doctrine,⁸⁸ thus seeking, from a defensive posture, to prevent "extrahemispheric" influence in Latin American.

Since that time, the interplay between history and American labor has been truly remarkable, each changing the course of the other. For example, during the First World War, U.S. labor's foreign policy in Latin American shifted to concerns regarding the threat of the Axis powers and the Bolshevik revolution. "The immigrants who came to most of the Latin American countries during the last decades of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth played an important role in propagating ideas which were then prominent among workers in the European nations from which they came. Thus, the basic idea of trade unionism as well as the related philosophies of anarchism, syndicalism, Marxian socialism, and somewhat later Bolshevism were introduced widely among the nascent working classes of Latin America."⁸⁹ These were issues of concern not only to the conservative AFL of those days, but also to U.S. business in Latin America.

Between the wars, the international expansion of Soviet communism was the target of policy and continues to be so

even today. Yet that policy was supplemented by grave concerns over the advent of European and Japanese fascism during the Second World War,⁹⁰ as well as by the sweep of right-wing dictatorships that took over much of Latin American in the 1960s and 1970s. Thus the foreign policy war was being fought on two fronts: against both political extremes. It sought the containment of international Marxism-Leninism -- be it in Korea, Cuba, Vietnam, or Nicaragua, although, in the case of the latter three, not without dissension from within its own ranks. [The subject of ideological splits within the AFL-CIO follows in this section.] While American labor is most closely identified with its staunch anti-communism, in Latin American and the Caribbean, the AFL (and later the AFL-CIO) is on record for its fierce opposition towards the likes of Peron in Argentina, Vargas in Brazil, Jimenez in Venezuela, Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, the Duvaliers -- senior and junior -- in Haiti,⁹¹ and more recently Noriega in Panama. To those who accuse the AFL-CIO of being so singlemindedly determined to "fight communism" that it failed to take a stand against the military governments that took power in Latin American, the AFL-CIO points to its struggles against Somoza in Nicaragua, General Lucas Garcia in Guatemala, General Garcia Meza in Bolivia, General Videla in Argentina, General Romero in El Salvador, and General Pinochet in Chile as documented examples.⁹² These right-wing dictatorships, after all, had extremely repressive policies against all unions. State Department officials admit that, at times, they were faced with having to choose between the lesser of two evils if they were to maintain any presence at all in a given country and nurture, if only behind the scenes, programs of democratic unionisms. Yet there is no doubt that Castro's victory in Cuba, and his "betrayal" of the revolution, set the tone for the Latin American foreign policy of the AFL-CIO for many years to come. Moreover, the operationalization of that policy focused more money and

effort on dismantling Marxism-Leninism than on building democratic institutions."³ Critics of AFL-CIO policy in Latin American have plenty of documented ammunition. Proponents of that policy have the same amount of ammunition, also documented. I would like to acknowledge these debates, along with those regarding the wisdom or foolishness of CIA involvement in Latin American foreign policy in the 1960s and 1970s, and move forward to the debates most relevant to the 1990s and twenty-first century.

The first of these debates is not new to the 1990s, but is in fact an old argument that still has currency. It asserts, in opposition to the AFL-CIO foreign policy, that communism was never the issue: poverty was and continues to be the issue. Proponents of AFL-CIO policy maintain that placing "poverty" over "communism" as a major threat is a false and misleading argument; that communism has never alleviated poverty, but has instead created it. They point to the economic achievements of the Soviet Union, now threatened with mass famine; the fact that East Germany's talented and young labor force moved West, leaving behind a communist economic infrastructure that held no financial prospects for them in their lifetimes; the current wave of Cuban refugees, washing ashore in Florida to escape economic hardships in their own country; and the continuing stream of Vietnamese boat-people who land in the Philippines or Hong Kong only to discover they do not qualify for political asylum because they fled from their country for economic reasons.

Critics of the AFL-CIO say that is not the point. That the AFL-CIO, through AIFLD (and again, in conjunction with the State Department) saw communism where it did not exist in Latin America. They argue that there were indigenous, class-based, nationalist movements in Latin America that AIFLD sought to destroy, since these movements were misidentified as being communist-inspired.

These continue to be important arguments because they —

have to do with identifying and drawing the lines of political boundaries. The manner in which these arguments are being resolved must be viewed within the larger context of two major historical changes. The first is that the concerns of the American worker have changed profoundly in the last ten to fifteen years. Second, the socio-political landscape of Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe has changed in the last two years. Both factors have compelled the AFL-CIO to alter its strategies and to fine-tune its priorities, while continuing to hold the same foreign policy objectives it has held in the past. Before turning to some of these changes, note must be taken of splits within the AFL-CIO itself regarding foreign policy issues.

Ideological splits within the American labor movement over issues of foreign policy

There is no doubt that American labor is a conservative force abroad. Samuel Gompers set that stage. Staunchly anti-communist, as well as anti-socialist, Gompers was a steadfast and uncompromising defender of capitalism. William Green followed in Gompers' anti-communist footsteps, as did George Meany and Lane Kirkland in subsequent administrations of the AFL-CIO. In fact, it was not until George Meany's tenure as head of the federation that American labor began to adopt more liberal domestic policies, such as support for the American civil rights movement.⁹⁴

But neither has American labor been a single, unified voice of conservatism. The Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), founded in 1935, brought into its federation many of those "dissident" trade unions that had chosen, for one reason or another, not to affiliate with the AFL. At its establishment, the CIO joined together a widely divergent spectrum of political orientations, including some —

conservative elements, as well as socialists and members of the American Communist Party (the communists were purged from the CIO in 1946 -- and it was after that date that the two federations coalesced as an anti-communist force). For example, the Reuther brothers -- Walter, Victor and Roy -- came from a German socialist background. Walter Reuther, first as head of the United Auto Workers and later of the CIO, always favored a friendly stance toward socialists and was not opposed to negotiating with communists. While Reuther helped engineer the merger between the AFL and CIO in 1955, he repeatedly clashed with Meany over matters of foreign policy. Their differing political positions toward Castro's Cuba are illustrative of the dispute. "Whereas Meany opposed compromises with Castro and his sympathizers in Latin America, the U.A.W. advanced the view that Castro had betrayed the Cuban revolution [against Batista] but that, as in Asia, the United States could best deal with him and his potential influence in Latin America by assisting in economic development and backing the democratic left, such as Betancourt in Venezuela."⁹⁵ [Note: The relations between American labor and Romulo Betancourt were explained in some detail, in the Venezuelan case study, earlier in this report. Betancourt, incidentally, was a far cry from Castro.]

By 1968, Reuther ushered the U.A.W. out of the AFL-CIO through his refusal to pay federation dues in protest over Meany's support for the war in Vietnam. Reuther had been a persistent advocate of non-military aid. Expanded aid, in general, had been a principle point in U.A.W. resolutions, while it remained something of a low priority to the AFL-CIO as a whole. "The auto union urged time after time that the problems of the Third World stemmed not from communism, but from poverty, hunger, and stagnation, and that these basic conditions would not be ameliorated through military intervention or military aid, but through American leadership encouraging the evolution of progressive forces"

and promoting social justice, freedom, and economic development."⁹⁶

Today, a generation later, this same argument is being echoed among some segments of the American labor movement over U.S. government and AFL-CIO alliances and policies in Central America, and primarily in El Salvador. The same language of this argument is often used by the federation's chief ideological "enemies", the Revolutionary Left. Despite the similarity in language, the distinction between the "dissident" AFL-CIO affiliates and the Marxist-Leninist groups is not to be confused. [Section 6 of this report, on "Issues", discusses the problem of language in deciphering political ideology.]

The 1985 AFL-CIO convention witnessed the first public floor discussion on foreign policy and, by 1987, more than 50 percent of the membership voted in opposition to the federation's Central American policy.⁹⁷ Even earlier, in 1981, a dissident faction withdrew its support for Federation policy and formed its own organization called the "National Labor Committee in Support of Democracy and Human Rights in El Salvador", headquartered in the New York offices of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union (ACTWU).

This dissident faction, whose steering committee is co-chaired by such labor notables as Douglas A. Fraser, President Emeritus of the U.A.W.; Jack Sheinkman, President of ACTWU; and William W. Winpisinger, President of the International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers,⁹⁸ protested the AFL-CIO's support for El Salvador's UNOC (National Union of Workers and Campesinos), a labor federation closely aligned with then President Duarte's Christian Democratic Party. The National Labor Committee set out to represent the voice of all unionists in El Salvador whose human and civil rights have been violated (no small or easy task, given more than 70,000 political deaths in El Salvador in roughly the past decade).⁹⁹ It

has collaborated in its human rights work with UNTS (the National Unity of Salvadoran Workers), a leftist union federation with whom AIFLD chose not to associate, claiming UNTS has direct ties to the Salvadoran guerilla movement: the FMLN (Farabundo Marti Front for National Liberation).

The National Labor Committee insists there is no such connection: that after a decade of collaboration with UNTS, never has there been any evidence of direct ties to the FMLN. The Committee admits that strong sympathies exist between some members of UNTS and the FMLN, but that there are no direct ties. AIFLD says this is not true: that ties do exist between UNTS and the FMLN, which in turn has ties to Havana.¹⁰⁰

The National Labor Committee complains that never has AIFLD been concerned with the human rights violations against any unionists affiliated with UNTS. In one of its publications, the Committee, referring to international law established for the protection of trade union rights, argues that, "The law does not state that only politically acceptable unionists must be protected, it states that the right to organize, associate and bargain collectively be afforded to all."¹⁰¹ But AIFLD has never considered Marxist-Leninist unions to be real unions, since they are not independent of ruling communist parties and serve instead as instruments of communist elites in power. AIFLD counter-charges that never has the National Labor Committee, in all its reporting on human rights violations in El Salvador, concerned itself directly with the abuses committed against unionists in UNOC.

The dispute between the National Labor Committee and AFL-CIO headquarters is important in that the fundamental issue is about political boundaries: drawing the line between those with whom one wishes to associate, and those one wishes to exclude from collaborative activities. It is the line between the group one trusts and the group one distrusts. At the extreme, it divides "friend" from "foe". -

Such distinctions get magnified in polarized settings such as the one in El Salvador. Moreover, they take on enormous meaning in countries where such decisions determine national political futures. The National Labor Committee and AFL-CIO headquarters have not resolved their disagreement on this issue. Neither have they made it the subject of ongoing heated debate. For now, each is pursuing its own policy in El Salvador.

Recent changes in the strategy of AFL-CIO foreign policy

The AFL-CIO's foreign policy has not changed. It remains -- indeed, must remain -- committed to defending, protecting, enhancing the needs and well-being of the American worker through an international program whose dual purpose is to combat communism and promote democracy. But the emphasis of the policy, as articulated by the AFL-CIO, has shifted away from fighting communism per se, toward building democratic institutions and a democratic culture, with a new weight attached to its dual commitment of fighting both the extremes of the right and the left -- politically and economically. The reason for this, again, has to do ultimately with the well-being of American labor.

On the Economy

Last year, in a speech made in New York City, at a gathering of the Socialist International, Lane Kirkland said:

"I am talking about the myth that the collapse of communism is the victory of capitalism and the final vindication of raw market theory. Yes, communism has lost, its credibility stands in tatters.... But to equate that fact with the transfiguration of Western finance and commerce, the Harvard Business School and the Chicago School of economic doctrine, is the sheerest nonsense. Millions upon millions have found out, in the hardest way and in grueling detail, exactly what

was wrong with communism. It is up to those who cherish democracy to do what we can to see that they do not now proceed to discover what is wrong with the jungle of the unregulated marketplace..."¹⁰²

On Human Rights

Although certainly not a new aspect of its foreign policy, the strategy of the AFL-CIO has increasingly reflected a concern for human, civil, and worker rights. It has operated to protect these rights of workers abroad, through the mechanisms of international organizations such as the ICFTU and the ILO, or through the passage of legislation in the United States that makes trade with a country contingent upon its observance of certain basic worker rights.

On U.S. Government Foreign Policy

Moreover, in the resolutions of its 1987 convention, the AFL-CIO took a clear and decisive stand against American foreign policy in Central America, stating that:

"The struggle for democracy abroad is not served by undermining democracy at home. The AFL-CIO is alarmed and repelled by the actions of some officials in the Reagan administration to circumvent the law and lie to Congress while attempting to fund the Nicaraguan contras.... We urge the Reagan administration to pursue in good faith a diplomatic rather than military solution to the conflict [in Central America] within the framework of the Guatemala Plan, that will provide guarantees of democratic freedoms along with a halt to outside aid to all armed opposition groups."¹⁰³

On International Labor Cooperation

More and more, the AFL-CIO has widened its net in terms of political alliances and negotiation. It has not

abandoned its fight against communism. However, in the absence of obvious communist threats and in countries where democracy as a political system is not in any immediate jeopardy, the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO have placed a priority on trade union pluralism and the representation of a wide variety of political complexions within federations they assist. ¹⁰⁴ ~~Not~~ ^{Not} uniformly so (for example, AFL-CIO political alliances in Brazil have been questioned by critics), but it certainly seems headed in that direction.

What has prompted these changes, in general, has been the increasingly threatened position of American workers whose jobs have been taken from them by companies that have moved their operations to developing countries. In the past, American companies abroad used to benefit the American worker by guaranteeing the steady supply of raw materials and manufactured parts. Now they have taken the jobs with them. In just the past few years, American workers in the clothing and textile industry have lost the shirts -- now manufactured in Central America and Asia -- off their backs.

AFL-CIO foreign policy objectives remain fixed on the same goal: the American worker. However, what was good for the American worker then, is no longer so. Today, the establishment of strong, democratic unions in countries where multinational corporations employ cheap labor is of direct and urgent interest to the American labor. Forcing multinational corporations to adhere to the same health and occupational safety standards in employing Haitian workers, as are applied in the United States, ultimately benefits American labor. Strong, democratic federations in the developing world that know how to affect domestic policies in their own countries, how to devise a strategy and get legislation passed that will enhance the position of their own unions, is important to American labor. This is the point at which American Labor, AID, and Democracy converge.

SECTION 6**ISSUES: US/AID, THE AFL-CIO, AND DEMOCRACY**

[A note from the author: I have reserved this section for my own thoughts on the matter of US/AID, the AFL-CIO, and democracy. Some of the concerns raised here are controversial, and meant to be so. They are not meant, however, to represent the views of either US/AID or the AFL-CIO, but to generate discussion around some issues that I feel may cause problems or conflicts in the future relationship between the Agency, the Federation, and Democracy.]

Making Choices and Promoting Democracy

The old American union song, "Which Side Are You On?", is often conjured up in the course of labor debates to underline the point that in political battles, one must be clear about one's identity. I am using it here to make the same point. I am not speaking now of definitions of democracy per se, but rather of making a choice of being on side "a", which necessarily determines that one is not on side "b". The decision to promote democracy implies that democracy, as an aim of foreign policy, is favored over other systems. Which "other" systems? And to what degree? Where is the political boundary -- the line of demarcation?

To say one is on "the side of democracy" is both a politically volatile statement and, at the same time, so innocuous as to render it irrelevant. Its political volatility can be heard on the nightly news these days, as certain Soviet generals are interviewed about the future course of the USSR and refer with such bitterness to "those democrats in our country who have ruined everything and who must be stopped." The innocuous nature of "siding with democracy", can be evidenced in union battles between, for example, the Christian Democrats and the Social Democrats, or between the American AFL-CIO and the Norwegian LO. Why would they be fighting if they are all democrats?

Moreover, to choose a side, implies choosing one thing over another. Here the other side must be defined with equal clarity, because we are speaking now of political boundaries. Once that political boundary is drawn, how deep will the commitment be to promoting one's own side -- democracy -- over that of another -- let us say, authoritarianism? Very deep? Deep enough to make enemies? Very deep, but without offending anyone?

Let me provide an example. Last year, the Asian American Free Labor Institute (AAFLI), received money from the AID mission in Indonesia, (from the Article 116e, human rights fund) for a specific program designed to inform Indonesian wage earners of their legal rights. The situation was such that, while Indonesian law guaranteed a certain minimum wage, many Indonesians were unaware of the law and were being paid wages that fell below that legal minimum standard.

AAFLI's program was straightforward: to launch an information campaign to inform workers of their rights, and to mobilize enough support to pressure the Indonesian government to make certain that the law was enforced. Banners were put up by AAFLI-supported trade unions in Indonesia that read: "The law guarantees you a minimum wage of 'x'. If you are earning less than 'x', then please contact Mr. So-And-So, at the following number:..." For launching this AID-funded campaign, the AAFLI representative in Indonesia was called into the American Embassy and scolded for engaging in activities aimed against the Indonesian government and therefore embarrassing to the U.S. government. Yet political battles waged against those in power are meant to cause some discomfort. What should AAFLI have done instead? Who was to have decided: The U.S. Government, the Indonesian Government, or the AFL-CIO?

The decision to engage in the promotion of democracy requires, therefore, that a clear definition be enunciated regarding specific political goals, and that a decision be

made as to whether those goals are worth pursuing if they "discomfort" the target of their strategies or, indeed, create real and lasting enemies.

One can argue that it was never the intention of AID to "wage war" in its democratic initiatives programs abroad. That instead, it envisioned a program under which proposals would be solicited from, for example, newly emergent democracies requesting help in their legislative programs. With this strategy in mind, let us consider the following hypothetical situation. The government submitting the proposal is a fragile and uncertain coalition composed of federalists (who hold 38 percent of the seats in parliament), the nationalists (with 20 percent of the seats), and the social democrats (with 10 percent of the seats). The opposition party in this case is the Military Officers for Social Justice (32 percent of the seats in parliament). These Military Officers had been in power for many years previous to the recently held free elections -- the first in decades in this country. The proposal submitted is to help streamline and enhance the operations of this legislative body. But the coalition is weak and it seems democracy is at stake with the nationalists now thinking about breaking away and forming a new coalition with the Military Officers for Social Justice. What will US/AID do with the proposal that was submitted? Determine that since the elections were free and fair to begin with, any coalition that emerges deserves US support? Offer support to the entire legislative body and hope for the best? Wait until the future becomes clearer? Provide money, but make it conditional upon the Military Officers remaining the opposition party?

Obviously, the easiest decision to make would seem to be against providing funds to a government whose future is so unclear or questionable. But then what is the point of funding democratic initiatives, once the political futures of countries are certain? What happens if the party in

question, in this case the Military Officers for Social Justice, begins to receive substantial sums of "grant money" from political sources in other countries, thereby threatening the future of this fragile democracy that had submitted the proposal to begin with? Does US/AID, through the party institutes, provide equal sums of money for the other parties in the coalition? Will the party institutes choose to do so? What if new coalitions begin to form? Suddenly, a decision must be made, not to "promote democracy" in the abstract, but to take a side in a political turf battle, the result of which may have far reaching consequences.

Another way to look at this is to ask the question: will a fascist or communist party be treated as just another party "in the marketplace of democracy"? Or, will US/AID be willing to provide funding to coalitions that include such ideological extremes only after those parties have been rendered politically impotent? What if they start to grow stronger?

The AFL-CIO has taken firm, often uncompromising, positions in its foreign policy pursuits. It has taken the heat, criticism and ridicule that comes with the refusal to deviate from a clearly defined goal, and understands that making political enemies often comes with the turf when waging political battles. Does US/AID envision itself pursuing democracy aggressively, or passively? Is it willing to offend people who hold "undemocratic power" or those who intend to hold it?

The foreign policy dispute between AFL-CIO headquarters and the "dissident" National Labor Committee (as described in the previous section), may "sound" trivial in the telling. Whether or not someone is a communist or has ties to guerilla movements "sounds" out of place in the excitement over the success of democracy in so many countries in the past couple of years. Yet the argument is anything but trivial. It is the same argument that caused

Reuther and the U.A.W. to withdraw from the AFL-CIO in 1968, and the same argument that then followed both the U.A.W. and the AFL-CIO to the International Confederation of Trade Unions (the ICFTU) in Brussels, causing the AFL-CIO to withdraw its very important ICFTU affiliation for twelve years (from 1970-1982). This is not really an argument about competing labor federations in El Salvador. It is a battle over political boundaries, with the National Labor Committee saying it is willing to accommodate -- at least "talk to" -- labor organizations whose political orientation is far to the left, while AFL-CIO headquarters says "no", that once you cross the Rubicon, you are inviting into your house the very people whose aim it is to destroy you. This is a fundamental policy issue.

Next, why do free trade unions of the democratized, industrialized West fight amongst themselves if they are all "democratic"? In addition to any differences they may have regarding their own political boundaries, entirely different and contrary economic systems are often represented under the larger heading of "democratic". Earlier in this report, an explanation was provided of the AFL-CIO's dual commitment to democracy and capitalism (with the latter having some qualifiers requiring government regulation, ultimately to safeguard the well-being of the worker). Will US/AID link its commitment to economic and political development to these same systems as they exist in our society? Or, will it promote capitalism (however broadly conceived) in its economic development, while being indifferent to the correlates of democracy in a given society when promoting its democratic initiatives programs? The "open markets - open societies" approach provides a lot of latitude, although the implication that capitalism and democratic pluralism are being promoted is quite clear. But what should be the policy if, in country "x", a party whose political program is clearly democratic, yet whose economic program is far to the left of what US/AID would wish to

promote or encourage, applies for money? Will the political and economic package have to somehow be linked, or will it be enough to know that the group's political program is democratic, although its economic agenda is socialist? If US/AID chooses to link the political and economic dimensions of development, would it not be defining its commitment to democracy too narrowly, or perhaps suggesting too strongly that the American way is the only way? In the case of the latter, where democracy might be promoted irrespective of its economic correlates, would US/AID then be contradicting or diluting its commitment to "open markets - open societies"?

Finally, do US/AID and the AFL-CIO ~~wish to negotiate~~ have common boundaries, or common lines of demarcation, regarding the types of programs that are politically (or politically and economically) acceptable? Or, alternatively, will the ongoing battles in our own democracy -- indeed a fundamental feature of pluralism and competition -- be taken into the field, as they have been in the past? The AAFLI example in Indonesia could conceivably be viewed in this light: as "just another democratic debate". More will be said about this later, but while still on the topic of "choosing sides" and "drawing political boundaries", important note should be taken of the difficulty that language, itself, presents in making political determinations.

On Language, Sound, and Political War

Language often disguises motives, and does so intentionally on both sides of political wars. Unless one is able to get beneath the language of an argument, the vocabulary may be very deceiving. For example, when American groups of the political left talk about nuclear disarmament, they usually want the United States to take the lead by making this first step as a gesture towards world peace. When East European opposition groups argued in favor

of nuclear disarmament in the late 1980s, they had in mind that the Soviet Union (and certainly not, even emphatically not the United States) be the first to surrender its weapons. Both sides sincerely favored nuclear disarmament. Yet their motives, underlying arguments, and therefore political ideologies were completely different. And so it is in all political wars.

The argument of communism has always resonated with a greater sense of social justice and a higher morality than that of capitalism. Distinctions between the language of Roman Catholicism and communism often get blurred in Latin America, while "liberation theology" thoroughly clouds the differences. Interestingly, the language of Roman Catholicism and communism does not get blurred in Poland. Neither does the language of Uniates and communists in Ukraine. Still, when it comes to language and vocabulary, communism has always had a decisive advantage over capitalism, while faring less well in providing hard evidence of its successful implementation.

People who argue against American imperialism in Latin America "sound" like Leninists. They may, in fact, be Baptists. People who hate Communists "sound" like Reactionaries. They may, in fact, be Certified Public Accountants. When it then turns out that the Baptist is also a Certified Public Accountant, the assumptions one made earlier, become especially confusing. The labels we use are often necessary shortcuts in our communication, but they are loaded with judgments. My labels may correspond with yours, without corresponding to your judgments. The language of political war can be misleading, since words can "sound" like one thing, yet mean another.

The cooptation of vocabulary by one political group over another imposes a barrier that is difficult to transcend. Dick Wilson, of the Free Trade Union Institute, told me of the reluctance of Solidarity trade unionists in Poland to recruit new members, since for the past forty

years, "recruitment" has meant "communist party political agitation". My own friends in Poland argued, just last year, against the formation of new, free and democratic political parties in Poland, opting instead to advance their political views through the Solidarity trade union. After forty years of communism, being a "party member" was such a distasteful concept.

Most communist parties in Eastern Europe have regrouped under the name of "Social Democrats" (or have used some variant of this new name), forming parties that are a far cry from "Social Democrats-USA". Thus, to effectively promote democracy abroad, one must be able to tell the difference between a social democrat and a social democrat.

Economic Development versus the Promotion of Democracy

An entire body of literature is devoted to the problematic and very interesting question of the relationship between economic development and democracy. Some analysts assert that there is a positive relationship between the two, while others find no relationship at all.

The purpose in this section of the report is simply to identify one of the points at which the two conflict in current US/AID programs and the programs of the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO. Many AID economists, working in developing countries and expert in their fields, argue strongly that every industrial society in the world, including the United States, has experienced its difficult period of "sweat shops" and child labor -- a phase each country must, indeed, experience until it can raise enough capital to begin the "non-profit" exercise of protecting the working rights of citizens. If one should like to know the Achilles Heel of the regional labor union institutes, the topic that raises their dander, the volume of their voices, and lifts them slightly out of their chairs in quick and emphatic dispute, it is the argument that sweat shops and

child labor are a necessary first step in the process of economic development. Make the argument and they will tell you to volunteer your own nine year old to work twelve or fourteen or sixteen hours a day, for pennies, in such a sweat shop, for the common good of national economic development.

This is an example of a battle common to American society: Are worker rights and health and safety issues so expensive as to put an employer out of business entirely, resulting in the fact that everyone loses; or, in a democratic society, is the health and safety of citizens more important than the financial gains of a corporation; or, will the financial gains of a corporation benefit the workers in the long-run, if only they could forgo some of the health and safety issues for the time being? This battle has simply been exported to developing countries, along with the projects of US/AID and of the AFL-CIO. It may well be that it is not a problem to have two American agencies or institutions, both funded by the U.S. Congress, working abroad at cross-purposes. Still, it stands to reason that with US AID extending its mandate to include the promotion of democracy, the number of battles between the labor and US/AID may well increase.

Political Conditionality

As mentioned above, the enactment and enforcement of child labor laws is one of the primary concerns of the AFL-CIO in its work through the regional labor union institutes. It is not a new cause. Samuel Gompers had written that his resentment towards unemployment was second only to his resentment towards child labor in his own country and "of all the countries of the world."¹⁰⁵

Obviously, free trade unions are old hands at fighting for and defending worker rights. In recent years, however, their commitment to "rights" has deepened and broadened. It

has deepened because of concerns enumerated earlier regarding the multinational companies who have taken away American jobs and have found labor to be cheapest where worker rights are unprotected. Their commitment has broadened to include more traditional human and civil rights issues, although such rights as "freedom of association" have always been the very foundation upon which their programs have been built. Over the next years, union-initiated programs to protect these rights are likely to increase.

This report was to include a discussion of the concept of "political conditionality" (~~this was a matter the team had agreed upon~~) as a mechanism through which democracy might be promoted. It seems appropriate to raise this issue in conjunction with the above mentioned programs for worker rights, since the political muscle of such conditionality is often used by the AFL-CIO precisely in this regard.

First, it is worth remembering that unionism is about "political conditionality": IF you do not raise wages, THEN we will strike; IF you raise wages only "x" amount, THEN we want "Y" extra days of vacation time. But, with international networks and alliances (and here is a fundamental reason why the choice of alliances is so important) the stakes of "political conditionality" become much higher: IF you do not ensure the safety of your workers through national legislation, verifiable at the factory level, THEN we, as a nation, will not trade with you. These of the "big" conditions.

There is an entire network of worker organizations and alliances at the international level that operate to monitor worker rights internationally, publicize violations, and pressure governments to see to it that national worker rights legislation is passed and enforced. Such organizations include the Brussels-based International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, to which the AFL-CIO is affiliated, as well as the United Nations-sponsored

International Labor Organization (ILO) that is based in Geneva.

In addition to these enormous international worker organizations, trade unions and federations in their own countries strive to lobby their governments to ensure their rights are written into law.

Beyond that, there are international trade agreements that governments are encouraged, by nationally-based unions and federations, to sign or enact into law. For example, the United States now has a tariff law, the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), that was enacted with the help of the AFL-CIO. Under this law, a country's ability to export goods to the United States is dependent upon its adherence to fundamental worker rights, as defined by the ILO. In general, the GSP has made governments in developing countries far more cognizant of their labor policies. For example, a publication of the African American Labor Center indicates that:

Under U.S. trade law, countries that are beneficiaries of the GSP must observe specific standards of worker rights. It is believed that the pressure the AFL-CIO brought to bear because of the [Central African Republic's] failure to observe these standards may have convinced the government to allow the reestablishment of a democratic labor movement and restore workers rights....One of the first things the USTC (Union Syndicale des Travailleurs de Centrafrigue) recommended was the the AFL-CIO lift its petition filed against the CAR before the U.S. Congress for worker rights violations and that the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) for duty-free import into the U.S. be reinstated.¹⁰⁶

The AFL-CIO is currently trying to get GATT to enact international laws to protect labor, which today is the only component of trade that remains unprotected by that organization.

Political conditionality is an extremely powerful tool and can be used very effectively to promote democracy, especially when matters of national security do not take precedence over democratic development abroad.

US/AID, the AFL-CIO and the arena for international democratic development

US/AID currently has programs in countries that meet certain basic requirements, the principal one being economic need. As a country progresses economically, it is removed from the US/AID roster of countries needing assistance. However, in many ways, those are precisely the countries that may benefit most from programs in democratic development. Korea comes to mind. It is not an AID country. Thailand comes to mind: a country slated for only four or five more years of economic assistance from AID. Nigeria is another -- with a tiny AID program, but still, a country that might benefit from political programs available through US/AID.

The regional labor union institutes have been able to get around such restrictions by, for example, working in Venezuela (not an AID country) with money provided by NED through USIA. Similarly, AAFLI works in Korea, not in conjunction with an AID mission, but rather through its regional AID grant that is managed from Washington, D.C. However, now may be a time to reconsider the list of countries that qualify for political development assistance, since without such a revised list, some major opportunities to make a real impact may be overlooked.

SECTION 7

METHODS OF EVALUATION

METHODS OF EVALUATION

In AID-sponsored or contracted evaluations, the quality of earlier evaluations becomes, itself, the topic of evaluation. This "evaluation of evaluations" is no exception. The major point to be made in these following pages is very simple: namely, if AID is to extend its mandate to include political development, a new method or format of evaluation will need to be devised regarding labor union activity. The format will have to be one that specifically reflects political progress, rather than economic progress. The progress of political development is, of course, more difficult to monitor since it is less qualifiable than economic progress. This matter will be discussed below in further detail, following a review of some of the pitfalls of the evaluations as they are now available.

The Lack of Adequate Documentation

While lengthy documentation does exist on the activities of the regional labor union institutes, by far most of it exists in the form of Project Appraisal Reports (PARs) and Project Evaluation Summaries (PESs) submitted by Project Managers, Mission Directors, Labor Attaches, and Country Representatives of the Regional Labor Union Institutes. Such reports are presented on pre-existing forms that are filled out by the appropriate personnel and are very brief and superficial in nature. Of the available PARs and PESs, most cover the work of AIFLD. This is understandable since AIFLD is the oldest of the regional labor institutes and the one that has engaged in the most extensive programming. By comparison, very few PARs or PESs exist for the projects undertaken by AAFLI and AALC, and none exists for the projects so recently undertaken by FTUI. There are relatively few comprehensive evaluations

(including evaluations undertaken by private contractors) of the work of the regional labor institutes, and again, none for the work of FTUI. Of those that do exist, all emphasize the economic development aspects of labor union activities. Some are devoted in their entirety to a particular project of economic development, such as agricultural cooperatives.

This general lack of oversight and paucity of evaluations on the part of AID regarding the activities of the regional labor union institutes is nothing new. In fact, it seems to be something of a chronic concern, as well as the subject of ongoing debate. For example, a 1980 joint GAO/AID audit of the AFL-CIO labor institutes indicated the following:

*"AID has provided funding of about \$109 million since 1964 to implement a labor program in the developing countries through the AFL-CIO affiliated Labor Institutes; yet, it has not independently and objectively measured the overall progress achieved on this program to date. As a result, the Agency cannot determine the relative effectiveness of the labor program against other AID-financed programs, how effective the program is in accomplishing its goals and objectives, and the contributions made by the program to the development process in the third world countries in which it operates."*¹⁰⁷

The problem does not stop with the simple absence of evaluations or in the general lack of data or evidence. The objectivity of the oversight function has also been called into question.

"... [T]he regional Bureaus, despite their having designated grant/contract officers to monitor the program, are unable to independently and objectively evaluate the performance of the Institutes because they are neither staffed to do so, nor are they given the necessary backstop by the AID field

Missions concerned to enable them to carry out this function effectively. AID regional Project Managers have visited various overseas locations of the Institutes for purposes of program evaluations; but, these visits have been limited in time, scope and frequency and to a certain degree have lacked independence because of the reliance for facts on the representations of the Institutes' Country Program Directors."¹⁰⁸

Finally, beyond objectivity there is the question of how much oversight is appropriate by AID over the union programs. The Auditor General's report indicated that:

"[I]t was never the intention of AID to exercise close control (over the Institutes) as that would defeat a major purpose for which the Institutes were established, namely their autonomous, non-governmental character."¹⁰⁹

The Relationship between AID and the Regional Labor Union Institutes

In some ways, US/AID and the AFL-CIO are "strange bedfellows". This is very important to understand on a number of levels, in order to grasp the difficulties they encounter with each other and with the "outside world", and to understand how this effects evaluations. The AFL-CIO is a political organization, with its sights firmly fixed on achieving its goals as an organization. It fights political battles with a determination to win and counts on its staff to be loyal to the federation and to its goals. It answers both to a large and powerful constituency of 13 million Americans and to the U.S. Congress that provides funding for some ninety percent of its international political activities. In fighting its political battles it has made both real friends and real enemies.

US/AID is an economic development agency of the United States government that is currently working through the

process of incorporating political development, in the form of promoting democracy, into its agency-wide programming. It has no constituency and, therefore, need not be accountable to one, but neither can it benefit from the additional power enjoyed by organizations with mass popular support. While it counts on the good work of its staff in carrying out policy directives, its survival as an organization is not threatened by political enemies and it, therefore, need not be wary of "self-criticism" voiced by its staff to outsiders.

Because the AFL-CIO is a constituency-based mass organization, it has some forms of power in Congress that AID does not enjoy. Yet the AFL-CIO counts on AID for its yearly funding (appropriated by Congress, but granted through AID). In a strange way, then, the federation is both dependent on AID and independent of it.

The AFL-CIO's political enemies, and here I am speaking of ideological foes (by and large, one could say these are the extremist opponents of U.S. foreign policy who find it easier and more effective to target a private voluntary association than the U.S. government, itself), make a career out of cataloguing the mistakes, errors and failures of the federation. Not surprisingly, come evaluation time, the AFL-CIO plays its cards close to its chest: survival instinct. In the same vein, despite a number of complaints I registered from AID about its relationship with the AFL-CIO, I heard not a word of complaint from the AFL-CIO about AID, even when asked directly. It may well be that the union federation has created problems for AID, while AID has never caused problems for the federation. But what I suspect is true is that as political actors, the regional labor union institutes prefer to have the top leadership of the federation deal with matters regarding its relationship with AID (more about this in a moment), rather than to raise those matters in evaluations. All of this makes it a little more difficult to come up with a give-and-take evaluation of

two partners pursuing similar development issues. These two partners are, in fact, organizations of differing species.

The AID staff, on the other hand, both in Washington, D.C. and in the field, has, over time, through frustration and disinterest, distanced itself from the labor issues pursued by the AFL-CIO. The background to this frustration and disinterest is best defined by the comment I frequently encountered at AID; namely, that "the unions were thrust upon us by Congress; AID never asked to have the unions be a part of our programming." This attitude came up repeatedly in the conversations I had, mostly in informal settings. It was by no means uniformly so: there were those at AID who spoke with great enthusiasm about and respect for the programs of the regional labor union institutes. Nevertheless, the comment about the "unions being thrust upon us" seemed to have set a sort of "theme" in the perception of the relationship by many at AID.

An AID staff member is assigned the task of "managing" the agency-funded regional union activities of the AFL-CIO. At that level, it can hold the regional labor union institutes accountable for the money spent, but cannot have a direct influence over programming. The reason for this is very simple. The regional labor union institutes operate according to policy set by their federation and, therefore, answer to Lane Kirkland. Hence, any question of strategies, program priorities, or goals, must be cleared through AFL-CIO headquarters, and not through AID. This leaves the AID staff frustrated that, while they must be accountable on the one hand, they have the power to change very little on the other. Thus, the AID staff feels detached from the programs, is slow to move on having evaluations done, and rather quick to forget that the union work is a prominent part of AID programming. Ideological opponents would have one believe that the lack of oversight of AFL-CIO activities abroad, and especially in Latin America, is part of a larger political conspiracy to keep activities secret.¹⁴⁰ I

would, therefore, urge the LAC Bureau at AID to initiate such an evaluation of AIFLD's programs in Latin America and the Caribbean and put to rest the notion of "secrecy by design". Neither has the work of FTUI been systematically evaluated, although such an evaluation is currently being scheduled.

Aside from feeling that the "unions were thrust upon AID by Congress," several AID staff members complained that whenever a small problem arose with the union institutes, it was taken directly to Kirkland and settled in the high offices of the U.S. government and AID. Resolving this issue would require devising a mechanism for grievance procedures at the lower levels of each hierarchy, but this may not be possible, precisely because US/AID and the AFL-CIO are both organizations pursuing foreign policy agendas, in which case seemingly minor matters of strategy and implementation are usually settled at the upper levels.

Beyond the AID staff charged with monitoring union programs (who were, in fact, exceptionally well-versed in the projects of the regional labor union institutes), few at AID understand the activities and goals of the AFL-CIO's international programs or have knowledge of the scope of their activities. The administrators and staff I spoke with at the regional labor union institutes were pleased that AID was now taking an interest in their political activities (rather than focusing exclusively on their economic programs), yet expressed a sense of frustration that AID still did not understand the role or activities of trade unions in an international setting. This frustration was attributed to the regular and rapid turnover of AID-staff assigned the task of monitoring union programs. With each personnel turnover, the federation had to explain its activities, goals and foreign policies all over again, from the beginning.

The rift between AID and the AFL-CIO regional institutes has extended beyond Washington and into the

field. When an extensive evaluation was done in 1989 of AALC programs in Africa, including site visits, Development Associates reported that the AID mission director in one country had never before met the AALC representative, despite the fact that both had been working there for two years.¹¹¹

In 1980, the Auditor General had reported the same situation regarding the regional labor union institutes in general:

*"There has been very little involvement on the part of the Missions in terms of participating with Labor Institute field representatives in the development programs."*¹¹²

And:

*"Labor Institute representatives are not, as a general rule, queried nor invited to participate in the development of country programs of assistance."*¹¹³

Yet I should be careful to state that neither is this "non-involvement" uniformly the case. AID and AAFLI have developed something of an "exemplary" relationship in the field. For example, in Thailand, the AID mission and AAFLI representative have worked together closely and coordinated their efforts. Last year, that Mission awarded half of its annual budget to AAFLI's work, indicating not only "congenial" relations, but indeed, a commitment to goals that are shared. It may well be that the incorporation of democratic development projects into AID programming, will provide the agency and the unions with many more topics of mutual concern.

Working with the Existing Evaluations and Reports

The evaluations that do exist (inclusive of the PARs

and PESs) on AID-funded union work focus exclusively on two areas of activity: labor education and socio-economic projects, with this latter category including programs such as the establishment of cooperatives, credit unions, housing projects, workers' health clinics, and union halls, as well as immunization programs, vocational training. But the situation is a little more complicated. First, in virtually every project proposal, the regional institutes identify their purpose as political. The following are examples of project purposes: (1) To build and strengthen democratic trade unions; (2) to "maintain a labor movement which is knowledgeable about the operations of democratic representative labor organizations"; or (3) to "preserve and expand labor leadership interest in seeking a democratically oriented labor movement with a continuity of experience and trained democratic labor leaders."¹¹⁴

Similarly, goals and subgoals might include: (1) The establishment of "democratic organizations playing an active role in the development process"; (2) "Maintenance of a free, democratic and politically non-aligned trade union movement"; (3) "Increase the participation of low income groups in the political, social and economic life of the country (provide members with channels and opportunities for democratic participation in the political life of the country)"; or (4) "Increase popular participation in the task of economic development, leading to a more equitable distribution of income within the framework of a pluralistic society and based on democratic institutions."¹¹⁵

Second, the trade union activity funded by AID was always understood to be political in nature. After all, early AIFLD proposals indicated that their purpose was to "counteract", or to provide a "counterweight to" the Castro-backed or Bloc-supported Marxist-Leninist unions in Latin America. Clearly, this was a political mandate. Third, there is as adequate an accounting in these evaluations, as is possible, of the "impact" of the labor

education program (which was originally a program on labor and its role in fighting communism, and later, on labor in a democratic society). The evaluations cover, for example, not only the number of courses and graduates produced each year, but also (at least in some cases) an update of the political careers of these graduates, both within the union structure as well as in national politics. What is clearly missing in these standard AID evaluations are reports is a political context in which these activities were initiated and the political context in which they were concluded. As a result, one has no idea in reviewing this documentation whether or not democracy was advancing, irrespective of union membership gains. If, for example, trade union statistics are difficult to get in a particular year because the country is in the middle of a civil war, perhaps that could be mentioned in the appraisal report or in the evaluation summary. There are dozens of countries in which projects are being undertaken in four different regions. It would take someone with an encyclopedic memory to recall the year of each subsequent coup or war or other relevant political event to fill in all the blanks of evaluations done in years past.

To some extent, the lack of adequate political background in the evaluations is understandable, since AID, as an economic development agency, has focused its attention in the past on those union activities that enhanced agency goals and objectives. But this matter is being underlined here for three reasons: first, to say that the regional institutes of the AFL-CIO have done a tremendous amount of work to promote democracy; second, to say that those accomplishments are not documented and have not been the focus of earlier AID evaluations; and third, to indicate that if US/AID will take on democratization as an agency-wide goal, the method of documentation and evaluation will clearly have to change.

Many of the standard AID reports on union activities do

include statements that are clearly relevant to the promotion of stable democratic, pluralist societies. Yet in these very brief summary reports, the amount of information provided is only enough to begin to raise further questions. Take for example, a Project Evaluation Summary for Chile, for the period from April 1978 through April 1979. Under the heading "Unplanned Effects" is the following statement:

"The increased scope of AIFLD contacts, within the union movement with government, management and communications sectors has provided invaluable assistance in resolving the political problems. AIFLD influence has provided a notable stimulus to a healthy debate over the future role of unions including most of the influential groups in Chilean society."

Such a statement clearly begs for more detail. What kind of "invaluable assistance" was provided through AIFLD contacts? Which "political problems" were addressed or remedied? What kind of "notable stimulus" was provided through AIFLD influence? Which issues were being addressed in this "healthy debate over the future role of unions"?

Attributing Credit for Program Successes

Sometimes many different groups work together or separately in solving a particular problem or promoting an aspect of democracy. In such a situation, it is difficult -- or impossible -- to properly and accurately credit each group proportionately. Presumably, some groups take credit for successes in which they played only a minor or marginal role, while others never receive the credit they have earned.

Along these lines, a 1979 PES on the labor program in Colombia, indicates that "The overwhelming importance of external economic and political factors, and of Labor's

internal cohesion and leadership make it difficult to assess AIFLD's contributions to Colombian Labor's successes or setbacks."¹¹⁶

The Time, the Place, and the Point of View

In order to adequately evaluate the projects of the regional labor union institutes, one would have to know (1) the political, economic and social histories of each country; (2) the histories of labor movements in each country; and (3) the structure of each individual labor movement or configuration.

Take, for example, the following situation. In the course of interviewing for this report, one of the non-union respondents alleged that the regional labor union institutes were not committed to making the unions they sponsored self-sufficient since the AFL-CIO wanted to maintain a relationship with these organizations and therefore refused to "let go" of them. Since "self-sufficiency" is often a stated goal in the projects sponsored by the regional institutes, and since some of the regional institutes had indeed indicated that such self-sufficiency was problematic due to the poverty of many union members, it seemed important to verify such an allegation. In asking respondents outside the regional institutes, including AID personnel who managed the AFL-CIO grants, if they had ever heard of such a situation, no two answers were even vaguely similar. The question was: "Have you ever heard of a case in which the regional labor union institutes intentionally refused to allow the unions they sponsored to become self-sufficient, so as not to sever the relationship?" The answers are listed below:

(1) If you are going to make such an allegation against the regional labor union institutes, you would have to make it against AID as well. AID is no less guilty on the issue of self-sufficiency than are the unions. [respondent on AID staff]

(2) That simply doesn't make sense because the AFL-CIO would be able to maintain a relationship with those unions anyway -- through the ICFTU. Besides, there is so much union work to do and so little money, why would they want to continue spending money on a union or federation that is able to support itself?

(3) The issue is not self-sufficiency, but rather competition from other donors. There are situations in which a union might be self-sufficient or close to it, but if the AFL-CIO's regional institutes withdraw their support, other European leftist unions -- hostile the US interests -- will step in and take over.

Determining which of these statements is true, for which country, during what particular period of time, would require a case-by-case study. Given the responses I received to the question, the original allegation certainly did not seem to reflect any trend.

One of the difficulties in evaluating the AFL-CIO's international programs is that any single piece of information does not get one very far. As with any organization, the federation is evolving. What one knew to be true about the AFL-CIO ten years ago, may or may not be true today. What one knows about the AIFLD program may or may not apply to the AALC. That "the AFL-CIO does not deal or associate with extremist unions," is true, but not a hundred percent true. That "the AFL-CIO is in favor of and actively supports privatization and private ownership of property," is true, but not irrespective of who it is that is trying to take over ownership of public or state property and under what circumstances. Painting an accurate portrait of the federation's policies and programs is a challenging task that absolutely requires gathering information from only those who have dealt directly with the AFL-CIO or its international activities.

Ideologies, Programs and Evaluations

"Democracy" as a goal is understood differently by different groups of people. Democracy, to a poor peasant, might mean the equitable redistribution of wealth, while to the successful entrepreneur, might mean the right to protect wealth and assets fairly acquired. Because there are so many different points of view regarding the elements of democracy and the order in which the democratic process is chartered (are democracies built from the top, down, or from the bottom, up?), in depth evaluations not only may, but surely will reflect different ideological or theoretical points of view. If the question asked of an evaluation is only: "Is the work the organization set out to achieve, actually taking place or being done?" then objectivity may certainly be achieved. However, once questions are asked about the approach that is being taken -- to build democracy, for example -- then theories and ideologies will always emerge. This is just a given. It is not meant to discourage projects from being undertaken or evaluations from being done.

SECTION 8

VISIONS FOR THE FUTURE

VISIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO have a "full plate" when it comes to issues of unionism in the developing world that require their immediate and urgent attention. These include export processing zones, free trade zones, structural adjustment, workers' rights, children's rights, and so forth. Yet several newer themes emerged in discussions with institute administrators and staff regarding their visions for the future.

While issues regarding women and those regarding the environment are not new issues, it was felt by some that these would become focal points in the 1990s. Women are entering the labor force world-wide at a faster pace than ever before. That in itself has natural consequences for matters such as birth rates, migration, health care, child care, women's organizations, and trade unions. It may well be that the AID's Women in Development office and the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO will find common themes in their work that will enhance collaborative efforts regarding women.

In addition, it was felt that in the 1990s, many different types of organizations and government agencies would focus their attention on environmental concerns throughout the world. Increasingly, matters such as "clean air" are being thought of in terms of basic human rights. It is likely that labor unions will also play a role in addressing the issue of the deteriorating world environment.

With respect to workers and union matters, one vision of the 1990s saw increased international competition by big business for cheap labor, coupled with international competition between workers for fair pay and acceptable working conditions. Under this likely scenario, companies will be taking their manufacturing plants from one developing country to another, where labor is even cheaper or where labor standards are even lower. Therefore, workers

and labor standards in one developing country will be pitted against workers and labor standards in another.

Wages will be threatened as countries attempt to remain economically competitive on the international market. It will become even more necessary to engage labor unions in taking a politically active part in the development of their national economies, so as not to allow workers to be viewed solely in terms of their potential role in export development. This will require a broadening of, first, the scope of workers' rights, in order to ensure they have a legitimate voice and role in determining the direction of national development; and, second, of the types of political pressure that would help increase the leverage of workers in their respective countries. One way of addressing this issue might be through enhanced and better coordinated regional action among union federations.

Beyond these visions of things to come, all agreed at the labor institutes that the revolutionary changes of the late 1980s that swept through Central and Eastern Europe and Latin America presented labor unions with new and very immediate opportunities to pursue democracy.

Finally, if US/AID is to expand its mandate to include political development, the 1990s will certainly hold many new opportunities for collaboration between the regional labor union institutes and US/AID.

SECTION 9

RECOMMENDATIONS

Over a million people from the developing world have undergone some form of union training sponsored by the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO. Tens of millions of others have been effected directly and indirectly by the unions these institutes helped to build.

In their "ideal" form, free trade unions operate as microcosms of democracy and of democratic procedures. In many parts of the world, the regional labor union institutes have offered citizens their first opportunity to voice an independent vote by secret ballot and to elect their own union leaders. The regional institutes have empowered workers by assisting them in developing strategies and legislation, and seeing that legislation make its way into law on the national level. They have taught them how to do research and collect data in order to formulate policy positions and argue them intelligently. They have served to bring together various groups in society (government, business, the military, the police, different ethnic and religious groups, tribes) to help solve the problems of labor. The regional institutes have provided newly emerging unions with the paper, the ink, and the printing presses to form their own union newspapers.

Over the past decade, the foreign policy of the AFL-CIO has increased its emphasis on activities revolving around democratic institution-building and on the defense of human and worker rights internationally. Changes in the status quo of the American worker have contributed to the new emphasis, while changes in regional socio-political landscapes have provided the AFL-CIO with more opportunities to promote its policy objectives.

With US/AID extending its program interests to include the promotion of democracy, the agency will have more topics of interest in common with the labor institutes. Furthermore, both US/AID and the AFL-CIO may find they have more avenues through which they can pursue or achieve their mutual objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONSSubstantive issues and strategies:

1. A decision will have to be made by US/AID regarding the extent to which it intends to link political development with economic development (open markets-open societies). The question here is: will groups with clearly democratic political programs, but with underlying socialist economic programs, qualify for the same assistance as those striving for "open markets-open societies"?
2. US/AID and the AFL-CIO should establish the similarities and/or differences between each of their political and economic boundaries, prior to program implementation in the field, thereby preparing themselves for either increased cooperation or conflict.
3. A separate study might be considered on the ways in which US/AID and the AFL-CIO could collaborate in their efforts to promote democracy. For example, if there is a health-care program sponsored by AID that needs to be publicized in country "x", perhaps the union federation with whom the regional labor union institutes collaborate would be willing to publish information about it in their union newspapers. Or, perhaps some collaboration might be considered where training in democratic procedures is undertaken.
4. Reconsideration must be given to the countries in AID's assistance portfolio to determine whether some countries that do not qualify for economic aid, might be included for programs in political development. Perhaps a separate list should be drawn up of pro-democracy country candidates not in need of economic development assistance.

5. If other donors such as the West Europeans, Canadians, Australians, or Japanese intend to become involved in issues of democratic development, it would be interesting to determine the extent to which their cooperation could be counted on, or their collaboration used to enhance programs. Moreover, if the use of political conditionality is being considered by AID as a means of promoting democracy, it would be necessary to determine the size and scope of the international network willing to take simultaneous action.

Evaluations:

6. A commitment needs to be made on the part of AID to undertake more frequent and comprehensive evaluations of the activities of the regional labor union institutes of the AFL-CIO. Even if a commitment were made to do an evaluation on a regional level once every five years, this would be a big improvement over what is being done currently.

7. Evaluations should not ~~be done to~~ include more than one region (one regional labor union institute) at a time. This evaluation is exceptional in that it was somewhat exploratory in nature and meant to take an inventory of projects regarding democracy, rather than focus on the details of project budgets and activities. Yet each regional labor union institute is so different from the other, that its special issues need to be addressed individually.

8. The methods and scope of evaluations need to be overhauled to include the "democracy" component. Observations made in such evaluations should be placed in a broader political context reflecting the current political situation in that country.

SECTION 10

APPENDICES

APPENDIX - A

List of Projects by RegionLatin America and the Caribbean

5110043 FY 55-76	BOLIVIA/Labor Training /evals./ C - AIFLD	\$ 1786
5120305 FY 65-74	BRAZIL/Union-to-Union Leadership Exchanges /no eval/ C	\$ 821
5130032 FY 57-74	CHILE/Labor /no eval./ C - AIFLD	\$ 2567
5140015 FY 53-77	COLOMBIA/Labor Affairs /eval./ C AIFLD	\$ 11000
5150116 FY 70-76	COSTA RICA/Civic-Social Research & Development /no eval/ C AIFLD	\$ 845
5150201 FY 83-85	COSTA RICA/AIFLD Camos Unions II /no eval./ C AIFLD	\$ 250
5150226 FY 85-91	COSTA RICA/ Agri Services & Union Development /no eval./ A AIFLD	\$ 2000
5180096 FY 67-77	ECUADOR/Institutional Development /evals./ C AIFLD	\$ 4840
5190003 FY 65-73	EL SALVADOR/Free Labor Development /no eval./ C AIFLD	\$ 775
5190321 FY 86-90	EL SALVADOR/AIFLD /eval./ * A AIFLD	\$ 10305

5190368 FY 90-91	EL SALVADOR/AIFLD P AIFLD	\$ XXX
5200184 FY 66-75	GUATAMALA/Labor Leadership /evals./ C AIFLD	\$ 479
5220083 FY 55-75	HONDURAS/Labor Ed. & Social Dev. /evals./ * C AIFLD	\$ 986
5220296 FY 87-91	HONDURAS/Strengthening Democratic Institutions /no eval/ A AIFLD	\$ 75000
5260098 FY 71-74	PARAGUAY/Labor Development /eval./ C AIFLD	\$ 153
5270063 FY 62-74	PERU/Labor Development /no eval./ C AIFLD	\$ 2084
5280010 FY 63-74	URUGUAY/Labor Leader Training Center /evals./ C AIFLD	\$ 2324
5430002 FY 84-88	GRENADA/Free Labor Development /no eval./ A AIFLD	\$ 966
5960004 FY 63-75	RegOffCenAm&Panama/Manpower Planning & Dev./evals./C AIFLD	\$ 2704
5970008 FY 86-88	CenAmRegional/Central American Free Labor Dev. /no eval./A AIFLD	\$ 3181
5980101 FY 62-88	LatAmRegional/CONTX-American Inst Free Labor Dev /evals. A AIFLD	\$ 74307
5980101	SUBPROJECT 1 - BOLIVIA /eval./ A AIFLD	

5980101 SUBPROJECT 2 - URUGUAY
/no eval/ A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 3 - REGIONAL
/eval./ A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 4 - BRAZIL
/eval./* A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 5 - CARIBBEAN
/no eval./ A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 6 - COSTA RICA
/eval./ A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 7 - REGIONAL
/no eval./ A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 8 - ECUADOR
/no eval./ A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 9 - GUATEMALA
/no eval./ A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 10 - GUYANA
/eval./* A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 11 - HONDURAS
/eval./* A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 12 - REGIONAL
/evals./ A AIFLD

5980101 SUBPROJECT 13 - REGIONAL
/no eval./ A AIFLD

5980101	SUBPROJECT 14 - REGIONAL /no eval./ A AIFLD	
5980101	SUBPROJECT 15 - VENEZUELA /no eval./ A AIFLD	
5980101	SUBPROJECT 16 - CENTRAL AMERICA /no eval./ A AIFLD	
5120028 FY 60-74	BRAZIL/Labor Min Serv Expan & Improv /evals./ C AIFLD	\$ 5431
9320093 FY 77-81	REGIONAL/AIFLD /no eval./ C AIFLD	\$ 887

Africa

6130203 FY 80-83	ZIMBABWE/Labor Development /no eval./ C AALC	\$ 832
6600019 ?? ??-??	ZAIRE/Labor Education /eval./ ???	\$???
6980363 FY 71-84	REGIONAL/African Labor Dev. /evals./ * C AALC	\$ 66540
6980442 FY 85-89	REGIONAL/Africa Labor Dev. II /evals./ * A AALC	\$ 26304

Asia

3980263	ASIA/NEAR EAST REGIONAL	\$ 5150
FY 86-90	/eval/* A AAFLI	
4980017	ASIA REGIONAL	\$ 23558
FY 68-80	/no eval./ C AAFLI	
4980263	ASIA REGIONAL	\$ 24400
FY 80-86	/no eval./ T AAFLI	
4930237	THAILAND/Labor Training Mgt.	\$ 190
FY 72-75	/no eval./ C US/DoL	
7300328	VIETNAM/Trade Union Development	\$???
FY 67-76	/evals./ C AAFLI	
9320609	REGIONAL/Seminar Asian Trade Union	\$ 35
FY 73-75	Women /eval/ C AAFLI	
9310001	REGIONAL/Small Research Projects	\$ 1388
FY 75-81	/no eval./ C AAFLI	

Europe

1810004	POLAND/Solidarity Support Prg.	\$ 1000
FY 87-89	/no eval./ A NED	

International

9070003	THIRD WORLD/Labor Force Integrat'n	\$	18000
FY 77-83	/evals./ T AIFLD-AALC-AFFLI		
9380601	THIRD WORLD/Labor Org. Dev. Prjt.	\$	7709
FY 81-89	/no eval./ A AID/O/Lab		
9070001	THIRD WORLD/Labor Ministry	\$	3365
FY 70-79	Manpower Dev. /eval./ T AID/O/Lab		
9070002	THIRD WORLD/Gov'n't-Labor Org. Rel.	\$	1690
FY 76-80	/no eval./ C DoL		

 Note: The persons listed below include only those with whom I conducted formal and lengthy interviews. Many others, whose names do not appear, contributed their opinions and ideas during the course of this evaluation. I am grateful to all.

APPENDIX B

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Regional Trade Union Institutes

Jesse A. Friedman, Deputy Executive Director, American Institute for Free Labor Development

Michael A. Donovan, Jr., Director of Finance, American Institute for Free Labor Development

Kenneth P. Hutchinson, Deputy Executive Director, Asian-American Free Labor Institute

Mark D. Hankin, Assistant to the Deputy Executive Director, Asian-American Free Labor Institute

Timothy J. Ryan, Program Officer, Asian-American Free Labor Institute

David Brombart, Deputy Executive Director, African-American Labor Center

Michael T. Lescault, Director of South African Programs, African-American Labor Center

Gebreselassie Gebremariam, Director of North Africa Programs, African-American Labor Center

Joe Davis, Director of Education and Research, African-American Labor Center

Paul J. Somogyi, Executive Director, Free Trade Union Institute

Randall C. Garton, Associate Director, Free Trade Union Institute

Richard Wilson, Director, Central and Eastern European Affairs of the Free Trade Union Institute

Robert Lovelace, Program Officer, Free Trade Union Institute

Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union

Charles Kernaghan, National Organizer, National Labor
Committee in Support of Democracy and Human Rights in
El Salvador

International Ladies Garment Workers Union

Michele Briones, Director, International Relations
Department

United Food and Commercial Workers Union

Stanley A. Gacek, Assistant Director of International
Affairs

Regional Specialists

Joseph T. Eldridge, Consultant, Lawyers Committee for Human
Rights (Latin America)

AID

Travis Horel, Agency Democracy Coordinator

Gerald F. Hyman, Director, Democratic Pluralism Initiative
Staff, Europe and Near East

Jack Francis, Acting Chief of Strategic Development and
Performance, including management of AIFLD grant at
various times since 1980 through 1991 (newly retired)

Peter Romano, AID/W, manager of AIFLD grants 1978-88
(retired)

Peter Sellar, Assistant Director of Planning and
Programming, new manager of AIFLD grant

Richard Whitaker, Asia Democracy Project Office, manager of
AAFLI grant

Cory Haynes, AID manager of AALC grant

Department of State

Anthony G. Freeman, Special Assistant to the Secretary of
State for International Labor Affairs

Bill Meagher, Senior Advisor, International Labor

Anthony M. Kern, Labor Advisor, Bureau of Inter-American
Affairs

Department of Labor

William Clatanoff, Assistant Director, Bureau of
International Labor Relations, Office of Foreign
Relations

Bette James-Settles, International Program Officer, Bureau
of International Labor Relations, Office of Foreign
Relations

National Endowment for Democracy

Carl Gershman, President

Barbara Haig, Director of Programming

InterAmerican Foundation

Julie Sutphen Wechsler, Senior Representative, Office of the
Caribbean

Consulting Firms

John Sullivan, Vice President, Development Associates, Inc.

APPENDIX C

GEORGE MEANY CENTER FOR LABOR STUDIES

Below is a sample listing of courses offered by the American Institute for Free Labor Development at the George Meany Center in Maryland during the years 1988-91. The first two courses deal with more basic trade union issues, while the remainder reflect those whose topics most directly addressed issues of democracy and processes of democratization. Thus, the listing here is not meant to be representative of all courses taught at the Center which are far more varied and include such topics as "Technology, Quality of Life and Work," "Occupational Safety, Health and Protection of the Environment," "Contemporary Issues for Women," and "Agrarian Development".

Trade Union Leadership

This course is intended to train trade unionists in those skills necessary to discharge effectively the duties of elective office.

The subjects in the course include the ideology and strategy of democratic labor movements; trade union administration; problems associated with organizing and methods to overcome them; collective bargaining strategies; dues structure, and union finances. Specific attention will be given to the study of the barriers to communication that must be surmounted in order to enhance the role and effectiveness of trade unions.

The participants in this course should be trade unionists with a broad responsibility for influencing the general outlook of their memberships.

Collective Bargaining and Research

This collective bargaining course deals in detail with the total bargaining process. Emphasis will be placed on

research and preparation. All other aspects of bargaining rely on a proper foundation being laid out prior to actual negotiation.

The course will provide the participants with research skills in the areas of company cash flow, impact of an economic settlement on regional and national economies, analyzing cost of living information, economic and marketing forecasts, conduct and strategy at the bargaining sessions, productivity and capital investment, deciding when to enter into coalitions, and presenting the settlement to the membership.

Participants should be labor leaders who have first-hand knowledge of, and experience with, the negotiation process. Also, they should have basic knowledge of economic research.

Organized Labor and Political Action

What was won through years of collective bargaining can be lost in five minutes on the floor of parliament. Therefore, Latin American trade unions must actively participate in the political process if labor is to represent its membership effectively. Concerning basic strategy for political action, the course will cover selecting feasible goals, managing problems inherent in political work, models of union relationships with political parties, decisions required when planning strategy, coalition-building, the organization of labor political action committees, voter-education campaigns, lobbying techniques, campaign finance, and voter-registration efforts.

Specific tactics to be covered will include organizing rallies, handling hecklers, chairing meetings, writing leaflets, developing issues, and placing publicity in the media.

Participants should be labor leaders with responsibility for political action programs. The ideal participant should be articulate and a strong motivator.

Education for Integral Democracy

Leaders of teachers unions will participate in this special course. In moving a nation towards integrated social, economic, and political democracy, teachers must play special leadership roles, both in their classrooms and in their unions' economic and political activities. Special emphasis will be placed on nurturing democratic practices within interest groups, political parties, and civic organizations. Providing the democratic political culture conducive to such internal democracy is a task in which teachers have special responsibility, because they shape the social attitudes of the young.

Participants should be teachers active in their unions' political and community-service work, as well as in relations with public school authorities.

Contemporary Political and Economic Issues

The course deals with the impact of the democratization process in Latin America and Eastern Europe. The global economy, its effects on developing countries and their labor movements are discussed, as well as the ways to assure the democratic society and its institutions.

Political Economy for Trade Unionists

To prepare trade unionists to press for national economic policies conducive to the strengthening of political democracy and social justice. This course will commence with analysis of such basic economic issues as dealing with inflation, the relationship of productivity to wage increases, the effects of interest rates on level of economic activity, etc.

Another section of the course will focus on Latin America's debt crisis and the efficacy of political democracy at implementing economic stabilization programs. This will be followed by analysis of alternative economic

development strategies and how each affect the distribution of income and the prospects for political democracy.

The course will conclude with discussion of the relationship between economic and political systems, taking up such issues as whether political democracy requires capitalism, and whether totalitarianism is compatible with socialism.

Participants should be union officials responsible for developing labor policy stands on national economic issues.

COURSE SYLLABUS

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of International Labor Affairs
Office of Foreign Relations

Labor Relations in a Democratic Society

Purpose:

The program is designed to illustrate the techniques used by all elements in a democratic society to ensure that labor problems will be confronted in a constructive manner. An objective as broad as this requires an understanding of the place of unions in a democratic society, their structure and functioning, their day-by-day operations in the economic sphere -- collective bargaining, chiefly, but not exclusively -- as well as in social and political matters.

To deal successfully with labor issues, however, simply understanding unions and how they work is far from sufficient. Employers and the public itself, through government bodies at all levels, play important parts in either advancing or inhibiting stability and progress in the field. It is the purpose of this program, therefore, to study management and governmental operations in the labor field, as well as the interactions of all three.

Sample of Lecture/Discussion Topics:

Contemporary American Society
 The American Political Process
 American Economy and Society
 Function of the Department of Labor and the Activities of
 its Office of Foreign Relations
 The Activities of the Bureau of Labor-Management Relations
 and Cooperative Programs
 An Overview of the Employment ^{and} Training Administration,
 with an Emphasis on the "Job Training Partnership Act"
 The Activities of the American Institute for Free Labor
 Development
 The Administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act:
 The Function of the National Labor Relations Board
 The Role of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service
 The National Association of Manufacturers and its Department
 of Industrial Relations
 The U.S. in the International Industrial Relations System
 A Brief History of the American Labor Movement
 The Process of Collective Bargaining
 Labor Management in the Airline Industry
 Social Security Pension and Welfare Benefits (Federal,
 State, Local)
 U.S. Labor and Employer Non-Bargaining Activities (lobbying,
 elections, public policy)
 U.S. Labor International Activities
 Dispute Settlement Procedures
 Enforcing Agreements
 The Function of Government, Labor and Employers in
 Determining Wages, Hours and Working Conditions,
 Unemployment Insurance, Training and Promotions
 U.S. Labor and Government
 Public Sector Labor Issues
 Management View of Labor Problems and Labor View of
 Management Problems
 Labor Relations in Post-Industrial Society: The Future

Sample of Lecture/Discussion Topics:

Contemporary American Society
 The American Political Process
 American Economy and Society
 Function of the Department of Labor and the Activities of
 its Office of Foreign Relations
 The Activities of the Bureau of Labor-Management Relations
 and Cooperative Programs
 An Overview of the Employment ^{and} Training Administration,
 with an Emphasis on the "Job Training Partnership Act"
 The Activities of the American Institute for Free Labor
 Development
 The Administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act:
 The Function of the National Labor Relations Board
 The Role of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service
 The National Association of Manufacturers and its Department
 of Industrial Relations
 The U.S. in the International Industrial Relations System
 A Brief History of the American Labor Movement
 The Process of Collective Bargaining
 Labor Management in the Airline Industry
 Social Security Pension and Welfare Benefits (Federal,
 State, Local)
 U.S. Labor and Employer Non-Bargaining Activities (lobbying,
 elections, public policy)
 U.S. Labor International Activities
 Dispute Settlement Procedures
 Enforcing Agreements
 The Function of Government, Labor and Employers in
 Determining Wages, Hours and Working Conditions,
 Unemployment Insurance, Training and Promotions
 U.S. Labor and Government
 Public Sector Labor Issues
 Management View of Labor Problems and Labor View of
 Management Problems
 Labor Relations in Post-Industrial Society: The Future

Best Available Copy

FOOTNOTES:

1. Paul Fisher, "The Economic Role of Unions in Less-Developed Areas," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 84, September 1961, p. 956, as cited by Bruce H. Millen, The Political Role of Labor in Developing Countries. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1963, p. 117.
2. The AFL-CIO Abroad (series on "Perspectives on Labor and the World"), AFL-CIO publication no. 182, pp. 3-4.
3. The AFL-CIO's Foreign Policy, (series on "Perspectives on Labor and the World"), AFL-CIO publication no. 181, p. 12.
4. Development Associates, Inc. (John H. Sullivan, James L. Rousch, Patricia Topping/AALC), "Joint Management Evaluation of the Cooperative Agreement between the U.S. Agency for International Development and African American Labor Center," June 8, 1989, p. 8 (Heretofore: Development Associates, "Evaluation of AALC...", 1989).
5. The AFL-CIO Abroad, op. cit., p. 1.
6. Ibid., pp. 11-15.
7. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AALC....," 1989, p. 31.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., p. 32.
10. African-American Labor Center (AFL-CIO), "Marking 25 years of African-American trade union cooperation: 1964-1989." (pamphlet)
11. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AALC....," 1989, op. cit., p. 12
12. Ibid., p. 117.
13. Asian American Free Labor Institute (AFL-CIO), "Teaworkers in Sri Lanka: A Trade Union Approach To Community Development." (pamphlet, undated)
14. AID Project Appraisal Report, URUGUAY, 1/1/70-12/31/70.
15. AID Project Appraisal Report, COLOMBIA, June 1973, Serial No. 74-4.
16. AID Project Evaluation Summary, GUATEMALA, 4/1/73-3/31/74.

17. AID Project Appraisal Report, PARAGUAY, 1/1/74-11/30/74, p. 5.

18. AID Project Appraisal Report, HONDURAS, 4/1/76-3/31/77.

19. The "Group of Ten" was an informal grouping of unions and leaders who had resolved not to be coerced by the Chilean government. They were considered, at the time, to be the only cohesive democratic labor movement in Chile, See, AID Project Evaluation Summary, CHILE, 4/77- 4/78.

20. AID Project Evaluation Summary, CHILE, 4/78- 4/79.

21. Asian-American Free Labor Institute, "Report to the Board of Trustees, 1989", p. 9.

22. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AALC.....," 1989, op. cit., pp. 110-111.

23. AAFLI, "Report to the Board of Trustees, 1989," op. cit., p. 11.

24. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AALC.....," 1989, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

25. Ibid., p. 9.

26. Development Associates, Inc. (Lori Forman/AID, Paul Bisek/AID, Jerome Barrett), "Evaluation of the Asian American Free Labor Institute Programs in Bangladesh, Thailand, Indonesia, Philippines," June 1987, p. 12 (Heretofore: Development Associates, "Evaluation of AAFLI.....," 1987).

27. Ibid., p. 27.

28. AID Project Evaluation Summary, CHILE, 4/79-4/80, p. 5.

29. Arnold M. Zack, "Evaluation of the African American Labor Center Project in the Republic of South Africa," March 23, 1986, p. 12.

30. The AFL-CIO's Foreign Policy, op. cit., p. 4.

31. Lane Kirkland, Toward a New Foreign Policy (series on "Perspectives on Labor and the World"), AFL-CIO publication No. 185, January 1989, p. 1.

32. The AFL-CIO is not unconditionally in favor of privatization. In Thailand, for example, AAFLI is concerned that the monopolies of the public sector might be bought off by an exclusive military and bureaucratic elite in that

country. Likewise, in Central and Eastern Europe, those individuals most likely to have the financial resources to purchase state enterprises are the old communist party elites. This is of concern not only to FTUI, but also to citizens and new governments in those countries.

33. "In Bangladesh: AAFLI Program Targets Women Workers," AAFLI News, Vol. 22, no. 1, February 1991, p. 3.

34. AAFLI, "Report to the Board of Trustees, 1989," op. cit., p. 11.

35. Ibid., pp. 6-7. More details are provided on p. 81 of this report, on this AAFLI-sponsored/AID-funded project in Indonesia.

36. Ibid., p. 12.

37. "Imprisoned Chinese Unionists Given 'High Priority': Now It's the Workers' Turn," AAFLI News, Vol. 22, No. 1, February 1991, p. 2.

38. See, for example, Pat Griffith, "Walesa here to thank U.S. unions for aid to Solidarity," Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, November 13, 1989.

39. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AALC....," 1989, op. cit., p. 90.

40. "Back in Action in the Philippines: AAFLI Assists Radio Station," AAFLI News, Vol. 22, No. 1, February 1991, p. 3.

41. With legitimacy, new governments gain credibility. In such cases, labor research centers become less important, as citizens begin to trust data gathered and provided by their own government.

42. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AALC....," 1989, op. cit., p. 36.

43. Robert Rothman, "U.S. Educators Introduce Democracy to East European School," Education Week, November 22, 1989; "A.F.T. Seeks to Foster Teaching of Democratic Ideas Worldwide: Pilot Program to begin in Poland," Education Week, January 31, 1990; "A Crash Course In Democracy: From campaigns to constitutions, Eastern Europe looks to U.S. advise on ways of the West," Scholastic Update, March 9, 1990; Ann Bradley, "A Union-Building Lesson for Polish Teachers: A.F.T. Training Solidarity Group," Education Week, August 1, 1990; "Emerging from Dictatorship: Teachers Around the World and How We Can Help" (feature article), American Educator, Fall 1990, pp. 11-23.

44. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AALC....," 1989, op. cit., p. 38.

45. Paul G. Buchanan, "The Impact of U.S. Labor," in Abraham F. Lowenthal, ed., Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991, p. 181 and footnote 70 on p. 187.

46. Leszek Gilejko, Związki zawodowe w procesie przemian społecznych w PRL (Trade Unions and the Process of Social Transformation in the People's Republic of Poland). Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy CRZZ, 1972, pp. 16-17.

47. Christine M. Sadowski, "Bread and Freedom: Workers' Self-Government Schemes in Poland," in Jack Bielasia and Maurice D. Simon, eds., Polish Politics: Edge of the Abyss. New York: Praeger, 1984, pp. 97-98.

48. Wladyslaw Ratynski, Partia i związki zawodowe w Polsce Ludowej (The Party and Trade Unions in People's Poland). Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza, 1977, p. 145.

49. Louisa Vinton, "Poland: Disparate Responses to Democracy and the Market," Radio Free Europe: Report on Eastern Europe, March 29, 1991.

50. Ibid., p. 35.

51. Ibid., p. 34.

52. Ibid.

53. Christine M. Sadowski, "Resource Mobilization in a Marxist-Leninist Society: The Case of Poland's Solidarity Movement," Journal of Communist Studies, Vol. 4, No. 2, June 1988.

54. The Swedish LO and some German trade union federations were also major donors to Solidarity. See, ibid.

55. Adrian Karatnycky, "How We Helped Solidarity Win: For Nearly A Decade, the AFL-CIO Quietly Aided the Outlawed Polish Trade Union," Washington Post, August 27, 1989.

56. John D. Holm, "Botswana: A Paternalistic Democracy," in Larry Diamond, Juan J. Linz, and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds., Democracy in Developing Countries: Africa. Vol. 2, Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1988, p. 202.

57. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AALC....," 1989, op. cit., p. 80-81.

58. Chai-Anan Samudavanija, "Thailand: A Stable Semi-Democracy," in Larry Diamond, Juan J. Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds., Democracy in Developing Countries: Asia. Vol. 3, Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1989, p. 305.

59. Ibid., p. 344.

60. "US freezes economic, military aid," The Nation (Bangkok), February 25, 1991.

61. Samudavanija, op. cit., p. 329.

62. Ibid.

63. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AAFLI....," 1987, op. cit., p. 14.

64. Samudavanija informs us that, "In 1983, there were 323 labor unions in the private sector while there were 91 state enterprise labor unions. However, the former had altogether only 81,465 members compared with 136,335 members in the latter." Op. cit., p. 329.

65. Ibid., p. 338.

66. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AAFLI," op. cit., p. 14.

67. Report to the Board of Trustees of the Asian-American Free Labor Institute, 1990, (in press).

68. In 1989 alone, 2,000 Thai unionists attended AAFLI seminars. See, Report to the Board of Trustees of the Asian-American Free Labor Institute - 1989, p. 5.

69. In 1989 alone, AAFLI-trained organizers established 21 unions with a total membership of 13,000. See, ibid.

70. Ibid., pp. 18-20.

71. Daniel H. Levine, "Venezuela: The Nature, Sources, and Future Prospects of Democracy," in Larry Diamond, Juan J. Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds., Democracy in Developing Countries: Latin America. Vol. 4, Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1989. Levine describes on page 284 some of the criticism of Venezuelan democracy, although he himself defends its many successes.

72. Ibid., p. 247.

73. Levine lists the lessons of Venezuelan democracy as follows: "(1) pacts and coalitions; (2) inter-elite consensus; (3) program limitation; (4) encouragement of

participation, but controlled and channeled; and (5) exclusion of the revolutionary Left. Ibid., p. 257.

74. Robert J. Alexander, Organized Labor in Latin America. New York: The Free Press, 1965, p. 151.

75. Serafino Romualdi, Presidents and Peons: Recollections of a Labor Ambassador in Latin America. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1967, p. 444.

76. Ibid., p. 445..

77. Ibid., p. 467.

78. Levine, op. cit., p. 286.

79. George C. Lodge, Spearheads of Democracy: Labor in the Developing Countries. New York: Harper & Row, 1962, p. 52; Romualdi, op. cit., p. 507. See also, Levine, op. cit., p. 281, for a description of the decision by the Kennedy administration and conservative elements of the U.S. government to place their bet in Accion Democratica -- a left-of-center party -- and against Fidel Castro.

80. Lodge, ibid., p. 27.

81. Ibid., p. 130.

82. Levine, op. cit., p. 257.

83. The second program offered through the Extramural Department is in the area of "women in development". This is a grassroots consciousness raising program, called WAND, that is community based. The third program, the Institute of Social and Economic Research, is housed in Jamaica, but operates regionally. It serves both as a clearing house for research being done on the West Indies and also runs courses on a number of "supplementary" educational topics.

84. Management International Systems, "An Evaluation of the Labor Leader Training Program," prepared for the AID Office of International Training, October 1989.

85. For an interesting appeal by Mexican labor to American workers, regarding the proposed free trade zone, see Arturo Romo [Secretary of Education for the Mexican Confederation of Workers], "Brothers, Not Enemies of American Workers," Washington Post, May 19, 1991, p. D-7.

86. Louis S. Reed, The Labor Philosophy of Samuel Gompers. Columbia University Press, 1930 (reissued, Kennikat Press, 1966), pp. 73-4.

87. Ronald Radosh, American Labor and United States Foreign Policy: The Cold War From Gompers to Lovestone. New York: Vintage Books, 1969, pp. 348-50.

88. Gompers wrote in his memoirs, regarding the establishment of a Pan-American Federation of Labor: "I firmly believe in the Monroe Doctrine -- not as an empty phrase but as a virile force maintaining an essentially American principle. The fundamental policy which I have pursued in the organizing of the Pan-American Federation of Labor is based upon the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine, to establish and maintain the most friendly relations between Pan-American countries, to work and maintain not only mutual good will among working masses of the Pan-American republics but their respective governments." See, Samuel Gompers, Seventy Years of Life and Labor: An Autobiography. E.P. Dutton & Co., 1925 (reissued, Augustus M. Kelley, 1967), Vol. 2, p. 512.

89. Robert J. Alexander, Organized Labor in Latin America. New York: The Free Press, 1965, p. 7.

90. See Romualdi, op. cit. Romualdi, the AFL's first Labor Ambassador to Latin America and later the first Director of AIFLD, was himself a political refugee from Mussolini's Italy. This is a fascinating account of the role of American labor in Latin America (roughly from the period after the Second World War until the mid-1960s), especially for its documentation of struggles against right-wing dictatorships.

91. Ibid.

92. AIFLD: Twenty-Five Years of Solidarity with Latin American Workers (AIFLD publication, undated), p. 5.

93. Spalding, Jr. basically blames AIFLD, the AFL-CIO, and American foreign policy for the failure of Marxism in Latin America. See, Hobart A. Spalding, Jr., Organized Labor in Latin America: Historical Case Studies of Urban Workers in Dependent Societies. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1977, e.g., pp. 264-276.

94. Alfred O. Hero and Emil Starr, The Reuther-Meany Foreign Policy Dispute: Union Leaders and Members View World Affairs. Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Publications, 1970, p. (?).

95. Ibid., pp. 61-62.

96. Ibid., pp. 62-63.

97. Buchanan, op. cit., p. 164. Buchanan presents one of the most balanced pictures of AFL-CIO foreign policy that I have read.

98. Both the National Labor Committee and AIFLD indicated that the co-chairs of the Committee are neither experts nor particularly current on political events in Central American.

99. National Labor Committee in Support of Human Rights in El Salvador, El Salvador: Critical Choices (undated), p. 12. Other publications by the Committee include: El Salvador: Labor Terror, and Peace (undated); Labor Rights Denied in El Salvador (1988); and ARENA Repression Unites the Salvadoran Labor Movement (September 1990).

100. Tom Barry and Deb Preusch, The Soft War: The Uses and Abuses of U.S. Economic Aid in Central America. New York: Grove Press, 1988, pp. 244-5. Barry and Preusch's argument with AIFLD and the U.S. government is ideological, with their point of view representing the Revolutionary Left.

101. National Labor Committee, El Salvador: Critical Choices, op. cit., p. 8.

102. Lane Kirkland, "Myths and Issues," The Bulletin of the Department of International Affairs, AFL-CIO, October 1990; reprinted in Lane Kirkland, Taming the Economic Jungle: A World Safe for Human Values (series on "Perspectives on Labor and the World"), AFL-CIO publication No. 214-01290-5.

103. AFL-CIO, Policy Resolutions Adopted October 1987 by the Seventeenth Constitutional Convention, AFL-CIO publication no. 3, Washington, D.C., January 1988, p. 113, cited in Buchanan, op. cit., p. 165.

104. Ibid.

105. Gompers, op.cit., Vol. II, pp. 4-5.

106. "Trade Union Rights Restored in Central African Republic," AALC Reporter, Vol. 25, No. 3, p. 1.

107. Auditor General, Audit of AFL-CIO Labor Institutes, Audit Report No. 80-30, February 29, 1990, p. 9.

108. Ibid., pp. 19-20.

109. Ibid.

110. Tom Barry and Deb Preusch, AIFLD in Central America: Agents as Organizers. Albuquerque, NM: Interhemispheric Education Resource Center, January 1990, p. 11.

111. Development Associates, "Evaluation of AALC.....," 1989, p. 60. Development Associates writes: "The USAIDs, for their part, have generally shown no interest in the program; at least one Mission Director refused even to meet with the AALC Representative. USAIDs have turned over their monitoring responsibilities to the U.S. Embassy labor reporting officers or regional labor attaches. In three of the four USAIDs visited by the evaluation team, AID officials did not know the extent of trade union activities....."

112. Auditor General, op. cit., p. 16.

113. Ibid., p. 18.

114. AID Project Evaluation Summary, CHILE, April 1978-79.

115. Ibid., AID Project Appraisal Report, ECUADOR, 9/30/73 - 12/31/74; and AID Project Appraisal Report, ECUADOR, 4/1/76 - 12/31/76.

116. AID Project Evaluation Summary, COLOMBIA, 1979, p. 2.